2 vols.
25/-

left [illegible] Puritans, but on [illegible] they [illegible]
[illegible] united; hoped to find him more favourable, and had been [illegible]
[illegible] Scotland under Buchanan a stern Calvinist. The Catholics
[illegible] for favour from one whose brother crowned a Mary & their cause
The Reformed Church established by law in England, hoped between
[illegible] extreme sects the King would [illegible] against both
[illegible] disappointed Puritans by a Proclamation enforcing "the doctrine & discipline
of the Church" he feared their tenets would uproot all government

Page 66 Established Church in Scotland ceased because its Ministers refused
to take oath of allegiance to Queen & Parliament visited since with [illegible]
[illegible] aid. Suffered great persecution after 65. All the penal statutes against
[illegible] repealed about 1800. Page 68 [illegible] Jealousy of Puritans
[illegible] reform in Services. Ministers & discipline of Church led to famous Hampton
Court conference 1604 - produced changes in Liturgy; Lots to pay by women forbidden
Absolution Service "Remission of sins" added. Some words in Gospels altered -
[illegible] present translation of Bible ordered. A Proclamation to Enforce
Uniformity of Worship, & use of Book of Common Prayer on all.
Page 85 The 20th Article Makes & Decrees. The Church hath power to
decree Rites & ceremonies & authority in matters of Faith & yet
[illegible] careful for the Church to ordain anything contrary to God's Word written
nor yet to expound Scripture at one place that it be repugnant to another
The 19 Article declares what is the Church viz a congregation of faithful men
[illegible] for the hearing of the Word & the administering the Sacraments
[illegible] Authority must rest somewhere. In the King or chief Magistrate.
87 The discourse prefixed to Prayer book "of ceremonies why some be retained
[illegible] would have satisfied the Puritans had they not determined

tablished by law - 2d that of R Catholics - to these he says he owns the Synod Communion
for he with the Church, but is a Mortal Enemy to her errors & corruptions - 3d that of Presb
whom he remarks though they differ from us but little on substantial points "ye
ir Polity is very untoward, they are so fond of Levelling, & so averse to all kind
ecurity that they are uneasy & disaffected to the State

ge 186 If Baptism does not confer regeneration on the Infant who has
committed no sin, & the same on the Adult who receives it worthily
d is only a sign by which Christians are distinguished from other men, & Chil
sign of Regeneration by which men are grafted into the Church, & adopted as
s of God through the Holy Ghost, & Sincere promises of forgiveness of Sins - Then th
men obtain Salvation
rament is a mere Rite or Commemorative & not the ordinary means by which

Page 123 See remarks on bigotry of Low Church meetings -

ge 201 The Puritans & Calvinists gained great power under K
ortunate man ought to have secured the Church - Parliament raised a c
ainst Popery & refused supplies - King James devoted to peace - but grea
Popular Power united to overthrow Liberty - Church & State Broken off - The
ctor ruined - England Scotland & Ireland (after Tyconnel's rebellion
ere Discontented - yet Parliament arrogated to itself all the power -
James dissolved it - not to overthrow the Liberties but to save the State

Page 212 Favourite topics of Preachers Predestination Reprobation
Election, Irresistibility of grace, & final perseverence
Jews holding that Infants ages before they were born were doomed
eternal punishment for Adams sin, by a decree they could not alter
ribing God to mock his creatures by offering Salvation & punishing them if
not accept it, & yet he has decreed from Eternity that Salvation cann
theirs - Thus denying that the death of Our Saviour is grounded of fo

James's was moderation & hatred persecution either of Papists or Puritans
was bent on peace - brushed the political Union of England & Scotland
he was learned - Pope terms his version of the Psalms the best in English
lies both on Sabath amusements, very imprudent - Puritans had plotted
even in Elizabeths reign - James in acknowledging Synod of Dort greatly erred -
During Charles reign these factions came to a head, which Elizabeth &
James had restrained but not subdued ——

Page 285

The King wanted money for the old feudal revenues of the Crown which
had supplanted Henry VIII^th had been alienated by preceding Parliaments
yet they refused subsidies unless to carry on the war with Spain which they
had provoked, & thus Puritan faction increased in each Parliament, so
in a few months they dissolved 1st Parliament

Page 290 Church of forms & emblems of Gods in Churches - To these Puritans
some effectual means to awaken mental association - & the
last we adopting or practising a set or ceremony but we abhorred every
ceremony which expressed Gods - It is one thing to admit the sign of the Lord & another
worship it - While the more rational Reformers opposed with so much the Church
the gross doctrines & scandalous lives of the Clergy, the more violent destroyed
every thing which seemed to oppose their ideas of Simplicity & Spirituality

Page 321 Convocation held it error in Puritans to reduce the Holy Communion
& Sacrament of Baptism to mere rites & Symbols - So those of the Real
(corporeal) presence of Christ in the Bread is an error of Papists, yet it stated in the
Communion that the Bread & Wine "may be to us" the Body & Blood of Christ (language
implying the worthily communicating - See 1st Corinthians 10 & 11

Page 326 - 2nd Parliament followed same course, & then remanded by King that
Supplies were necessary they formed committees on Religion - & Impeachment
of Buckingham - It met Feb 6th & dissolved June 15 - 1626 - Puritans grossly
inflamed by the proceedings in Convocation - & became irreconcilable

Page 329 Laud ordered to prepare a letter to Clergy to urge a loan
in support of Protestantism abroad - this measure caused much
displeasure but King had no other resource

Page 349 Puritans erred in making Old Test^t examples their model
Its political economy has no bearing on us at all - Many
of its precepts & some of those of New Test^t (as the practice of the Apostles
with the Heathen while planting the Churches) are exceptional & temporary
and are given for our example not for our instruction or edification

THE

LIFE AND TIMES

OF

WILLIAM LAUD, D.D.

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

BY

JOHN PARKER LAWSON, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

MDCCCXXIX.

5199
L28L3
v.1

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S-SQUARE.

PREFACE.

In appearing for the first time in an *avowed* manner before the Public, it is allowable to indulge in a few introductory remarks. I am well aware of the delicacy of the subjects which I have attempted to discuss, and I am also aware of the popular feeling which exists respecting them. This, however, has not deterred me from stating my own opinions, which I am strongly disposed to maintain, because I believe them to be true; and they are to be ascribed neither to particular connexions, nor to the prejudices of education, but to a candid conviction, resulting from anxious and laborious research.

It has often appeared to me a singular circumstance, that in this prolific age of literature, no complete biographical history of Archbishop Laud should have appeared. When I reflected on the many celebrated names which adorn our national literature,

48867

—distinguished alike for their loyalty, their talents, and their learning, I had anticipated that a work such as the present would have fallen into the hands of some writer, whose reputation would, perhaps, have given additional authority to his opinions. When I reflected, again, on the distinguished place which such men as Archbishop Laud hold in our national history,—that they lived at periods confessedly the most momentous and interesting in the English annals, I could not refrain from surprise that those who had been the glory and the renown of their age, both in Church and State, should thus be neglected by modern writers.

For myself, I can truly say, that a sincere desire to search after truth, and a wish to rescue the memory of a great man from opprobrium, have been my chief motives in this undertaking. Educated as I have principally been at a Northern University, having generally resided during that period, (excepting the winter seasons, when I was pursuing my academical studies,) in places sequestered, and remote from business, and the bustle of active life, I cannot be supposed to have formed those connexions to

which many look forward with fond anticipation, to whom fortune has been more propitious, and circumstances more favourable. I submit this work to the Public, therefore, trusting solely to their opinion as the reward of my labours. Whatever may be thought of the propositions I have advanced, sure I am that they are offered in singleness of heart, and in firm devotion to that Church, to which I reckon it my privilege and my happiness to belong.

The Memoirs of Archbishop Laud, written by his chaplain, Dr. Peter Heylin, are of great importance in a history of the Primate's life and times; but this work, which was published twice, first in 1668, and again in 1671, (London, folio) is now a rare book, and seldom to be found except in our public libraries. Notwithstanding its value, it labours under great disadvantages. Many of the facts recorded therein are not correct; which is easily to be accounted for, as Dr. Heylin, who died in 1662, had never seen the *authentic* copy of Laud's Diary, [which was published by the learned Henry Wharton in 1695,] but was compelled to make use of Prynne's disgraceful publication of it,

entitled the Breviat, published in 1644, in which that individual, after he had most illegally and nefariously seized the Primate's private papers, altered, mutilated, omitted, and inserted whatever he pleased, in order to inflame the public mind against the Archbishop. Thus, the defects of Dr. Heylin's work, although I have found it extremely useful in the course of my labours, are the results of circumstances over which that learned man had no control: and I am certain that, had he seen the authentic copy of the Diary, his work would have been complete.

I have been greatly assisted by an article contained in the eleventh and twelfth Numbers of the Scottish Episcopal Magazine, an able periodical work, which is unfortunately but little known, and now discontinued. These Numbers contain a memoir of Archbishop Laud, bare, indeed, in facts, from the necessarily confined space of the medium through which the account was given to the world, but abounding with admirable and profound observations. Its author, to whom I am indebted, in common with others who adhere to a now depressed and humble Communion, for many excellent and valuable

instructions, is one of the most learned and distinguished members of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

It may be necessary to mention some other sources whence I have derived my information. In the Library of the Honourable and Learned the Faculty of Advocates, at Edinburgh, I found much important information. That noble Institution contains a vast collection of MSS. on Scottish history, as well as on other subjects, and I perused those which relate to this work.

From the Library of the University of Edinburgh, I have received some valuable hints from various documents and books.

The MSS. in the Library of the University of Glasgow are of greater value. There, among others, are preserved the Wodrow MSS., the fruit of the labours of the indefatigable Robert Wodrow, a Presbyterian minister at the period of the Revolution, and Professor of Divinity in that University. By the kindness of a friend, I

received various important communications on the affairs of Scotland from those MSS., to which I have referred in the proper place.

But in the Library of our splendid national establishment, the British Museum, the historical inquirer may freely indulge his favourite pursuits. Encomium on this Establishment is needless: in it, besides the printed books, the valuable MSS. on every subject are inexhaustible, and are submitted to the perusal of the student with the utmost promptness. Access to such a Library is an invaluable privilege. Besides the MSS., and the productions of the seventeenth century, which I consulted, and to which I have referred, many of the Archbishop's original letters are there preserved. I transcribed the most interesting; and I proposed to insert a few of them, but my limits precluded me from making use of these and other documents in the present work, farther than by reference.

The principal papers of the Archbishop, however, are to be found in St. John's College, Oxford. Some of these have already been published by the learned Henry

Wharton, and in the Second Volume of Archbishop Laud's Remains, edited by his father, and published in folio, 1700. Those preserved in St. John's College relate chiefly to the University during his Chancellorship, which have merely a local interest, and would be serviceable only in a history of that venerable seat of learning. To some of these I have referred, in detailing the Archbishop's proceedings at Oxford.

It is unnecessary to observe, that, after all, the Diary of the Archbishop must be the great text-book in a history of his life. For this valuable work the world is indebted to the learned Henry Wharton, who too soon for his country closed his short and useful life. This publication has established the infamy of Prynne. Printed with the Archbishop's affecting History of his Troubles and Trials, written by himself while a prisoner, with other interesting documents, it forms a valuable folio volume. It is quite refreshing, after perusing Prynne's disgraceful and mutilated edition of the Diary, and his "Canterburie's Doome," to turn to a work in

which reason and learning prevail, in contradistinction to fanaticism and want of judgment.

In the progress of the present work, besides the MSS. preserved in the public Libraries, I have consulted upwards of *three hundred* works, exclusive of numerous biographies and general histories of recent date, which I perused rather to ascertain the sentiments of the different writers, than in the hope of discovering any new or unknown facts. From the above number of works, more than *two hundred* are cited in the following volumes. As these are principally our great standard authorities, this Life of Archbishop Laud, the Notes to which I consider its most important part, will supply the historical student with a very ample list of all the principal writers on the history of that age.

I am desirous that it should be understood that throughout these volumes I have discussed *systems* alone, not *individuals;* the former I hold to be fair subjects of discussion, the latter not; and it is in this light,

therefore, that I wish my remarks to be viewed as exclusively my own, and as neither maintained nor denied by the Church to which I belong.

I am aware that many of the sentiments, both political and ecclesiastical, contained in this work, are neither common nor popular; but it does not follow, that because a doctrine is unpopular, it is therefore false. That Archbishop Laud died a martyr for the Church of England, no man can have the slightest doubt. Persecution is detestable, under whatever form, and by whomsoever inflicted—whether it proceed from Popish Conclaves, Parliamentary Committees on religion, Presbyterian Synods or General Assemblies.

Much has been said and written on the history of this momentous period, and much difference of opinion exists on those eventful times. I quote on this subject, with satisfaction, the following passage from a well-known periodical Journal:—

"Did our limits permit, we would show

what has been well observed by a most diligent and meritorious author *, intimately conversant with the history of that age, and better acquainted than any other person with what were then the bearings and effects of religious opinions upon ecclesiastical affairs, that the constitution, even at its deepest depression in Charles' days, contained within itself copious materials for self-restoration, and that the course pursued by the Calvinistic malcontents, was not that which the laws suggested for the redress of grievances. We would show that the grievances which excited discontentment arose from no scheme of tyranny in the crown, but from the remains of feudal oppression, and the rapacity of powerful men, among whom were some of those who were most active in instigating and directing the rebellion; that the financial difficulties which accelerated the crisis, and without which that crisis could not have been brought about, were not produced by any wasteful expenditure on the part of Charles' govern-

* Mr. James Nichols, in his "Calvinism and Arminianism compared."

ment, but by the conduct of Parliament at the commencement of his reign, in withholding the just and necessary supplies; and, finally, by the Scottish insurrection, raised by the intrigues of France, and of a knot of factious men, who are at this day called patriots by a certain party, because, having succeeded in rebellion, they escaped the punishment of treason; that the intolerance and persecution were not on the side of the Laws and the Establishment, but of the Puritans; that there was no design of subverting the liberties of the nation, but that there was a settled purpose of overthrowing the Church and the Monarchy; that the King appealed to the laws, and his opponents to the prejudices, the passions, and the physical force of the people. It is impossible for us here to enter upon this wide subject, but we will not suppose that the duty *(for such it has become in this age of systematic misrepresentation)* will long remain unperformed; rather we will hope, that it may be undertaken by some person qualified for the task by ability, industry, and accuracy, added to those principles which were formerly the proud characteristics of England, and on which the strength and the

safety of these kingdoms are founded, and alone can rest *."

I may here add, that such a work I have determined to undertake; not, certainly, in the presumptuous hope that I shall be able to supply the desideratum so forcibly pointed out by the learned Reviewer, but with a view to lay before the Public a plain and authentic history of the enormities of that turbulent age. Having enjoyed opportunities of obtaining much knowledge of the authorities relating to that eventful period of history, and having access to the principal Libraries both of England and Scotland, it will be my endeavour to collate these authorities with the utmost impartiality, sparing neither time nor industry in the laborious research. I have already proceeded a considerable way in the first volume: but various circumstances prevent me from fixing the period of its completion. I propose to commence from the death of Henry VIII., and to continue the narrative till the Revolution, or, perhaps, till the Accession of the House of Hanover.

* Quarterly Review, No. lxxiii. Vol. xxxvii. p. 237, 238.

In conclusion, I have only to observe, that, should the present work meet with the approbation of the Public, a third volume will be added, containing the select Theological Works of Archbishop Laud, most of which have never been republished since the life-time of the Primate. This volume will contain :—1. The Archbishop's Sermons, preached on public occasions. 2. An Abstract of his incomparable Treatise against the Church of Rome, entitled, the Conference with Fisher the Jesuit. 3. His Manual of Private Prayers and Devotions; and, 4. His Speeches on various public occasions. The whole will be accompanied with notes and illustrations from rare and original documents now in my possession, or to which I enjoy the privilege of access. Such a republication will, I trust, prove a desirable addition to modern theological literature.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

1573—1603.

PAGE

Birth of Laud—His family connections—Notices of them—Laud's education—Sent to St. John's College, Oxford—Dr. John Buckeridge—Notice of him—Is Laud's tutor—Reputation of Laud—His conduct at the University—Admitted into Holy Orders—Bishop Young—Principles of Laud—Calvinism, its nature and tendency—Its unhappy influence in the Church of England—The Puritans—Conduct of Laud—Remarks ..... 1—43

CHAPTER II.

1603—1604.

Accession of James I.—State of parties at that period—Religious feeling—Conduct of James—Remarks on his life—The Presbyterians—Insolence of their ministers—The Scottish Episcopal Church—Review of the Puritan objections to Episcopacy—The Hampton Court Conference—Its objects and results—Remarks on the Articles—Concluding observations ..... 43—91

CHAPTER III.

1604—1606.

PAGE

Promotion of Laud—James' first Parliament—His speech—Meeting of the Convocation—Death of Archbishop Whitgift—Notices of his life—His character—Laud becomes B.D.—His exercise on that occasion—Dispute with the Puritans—Cardinal Bellarmine—Arguments of Laud—Remarks on his opinions—Story of the Earl of Devonshire—Unfortunate conduct of Laud—His repentance—Is traduced as a Papist—Letter from Bishop Hall—Reflections on Laud's conduct ..... 91—126

CHAPTER IV.

1606—1616.

Archbishop Bancroft—His prudent conduct—Laud's preferments—His generosity—Bishop Neile—Hatred of Abbot towards Laud—Friendship of Bishop Neile—Laud is chosen President of St. John's—His election disputed—Decided in his favour by the King—His conduct—Death of Archbishop Bancroft—His character—Inconsistencies of the Puritans—Their inveterate prejudices—Danger and evil of sectarianism—Promotion of Archbishop Abbot—His enthusiasm—Encouragement of the Puritans—Effects of his Primacy—His opposition to Laud—Laud's promotion—Dr. Robert Abbot—His sermon against Laud—Gloucester Cathedral—Instructions of the King to the University of Oxford.... 126—165

CHAPTER V.

1616—1619.

PAGE

Remarks on the state of Scotland—James resolves to visit that kingdom—Remarkable violence of the Presbyterian ministers—Proposal for a union between Scotland and England defeated—Consecration of the Scottish Bishops at Westminster—Departure of James—His arrival in Scotland—Laud accompanies him—The Scottish Parliament—The Perth Articles—General Assembly—Ratification of the Perth Articles—Return of James to England—Laud arrives at Oxford—Is inducted into the Rectory of Ibstock—Death of Dr. Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury..... 165—184

CHAPTER VI.

1619—1622.

Political errors of James—Clamours against Laud—His promotion—Made Prebend of Westminster—Selfish conduct of Bishop Williams—Promotion of Laud to the See of St. David's—Fruitless opposition of Archbishop Abbot—Aspect of the times—Archbishop Abbot's misfortunes—He kills a game-keeper by accident—History of the affair—He is pardoned by the King—Consecration of the new Bishops—Their unfounded scruples—Diligence of Laud—His primary Visitation—Advantages of it—His return to London—The Parliament—Distressing situation of the King—Vindication of James—The Parliament is dissolved—Intrigues of the Puritans—Calvinism—Remarks on Predestination—Its effects—

PAGE

Instructions of the King to the Clergy—Critical situation of the Church of England—Intrigues of the Papists—The famous Conference between Laud and Fisher the Jesuit—Extracts from the relation of it—His sentiments on error ..... 184—227

CHAPTER VII.

1622—1625.

Laud's connexion with the Duke of Buckingham—Notice of that favourite—The Prince of Wales—Intended marriage with the Infanta—His journey to Spain with Buckingham—Their adventures—False assertions of Laud's enemies—Zeal of Archbishop Abbot—Insolence of the Papists—Cunning intrigues of Bishop Williams—Enmity to Laud—Conduct of the Archbishop towards Laud—Instances of Laud's piety—Meeting of the Parliament—Remarkable conduct of Abbot—Opposition of Laud to Buckingham—Moderation of that nobleman—Negociations with France—Death of James I.—His character—His conduct towards Scotland—The Book of Sports—Defence of James—His character by Archbishop Spottiswoode . . . . . 227—263

CHAPTER VIII.

1625—1626.

Accession of Charles I.—State of the nation—Character of the King—the Duke of Buckingham—Bishop Laud—Proceedings of the King—Intrigues of Laud's enemies—Marriage of Charles I.—Meeting of the first Parliament—Its proceedings—Remarks on it—Dr. Richard

PAGE

Montague—Bishop Williams—Proclamation of the King —Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—Exertions of Laud —His appointment at the Coronation to officiate as Dean of Westminster — The Regalia—He regulates Westminster Abbey—Coronation of Charles I.—The Coronation oath—False charges against Laud—The second Parliament—Intended impeachment of Buckingham —he is vindicated by the King—Conclusion of the second Parliament—Practices against Laud—Dr. Goodman—Proclamation of the King..... 263—327

CHAPTER IX.

1626—1628.

Removal of Laud to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells— His appointment to manage the subsidies by loan—Remarks on his instructions—Apology for the King's conduct—His hazardous situation—Death of Bishop Andrews—Laud's appointment — Bishop Williams—His conduct—Comment on it—Dr. Sibthorpe and Sir John Lamb—Sermons by Dr. Sibthorpe and Dr. Manwaring —Their fallacious positions—Passive obedience—Sentiments of the two preachers—Remarks on the doctrine of non-resistance—Definition of it—The opinions of the Classic writers and the Primitive Christians—Of modern writers—Publication of the sermons—Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—His sequestration—Received again into favour—Public affairs—Transactions of Buckingham—Promotion of Laud—The Bishopric of London— Its importance—Dr. Montaigne—Death of Archbishop Matthews of York—The third Parliament—Impolitic measures of the King—Meeting of the Parliament— Conduct of the Commons—Their proceedings—Speci-

PAGE

mens of their injustice—Their practices—Arminianism —Subtle tenets of Calvin—Remarks on Arminianism— Definition of it—Observations on the Synod of Dort— Remonstrance of the Commons against Laud and Neile —Pretended Letter of a Jesuit—Remarks on it—Practices of the Jesuits—Their union with the Puritans— Prorogation of the Parliament—Laud removed to the Bishopric of London—General observations .... 327—424

CHAPTER X.

1628—1629.

Insinuations against Laud—His conduct—Preparations for the war with France—The Duke of Buckingham assumes the command—He proceeds to Portsmouth—Is there assassinated—Account of the murder—Public expressions of detestation—Character of Buckingham— Laud's conduct—Consecration of Dr. Montague—The exceptions against it over-ruled—Examination of Felton, the Duke's murderer—His trial and execution— The University of Oxford—Laud's care and munificence —His patronage of learning—The King's Declaration —Its nature and tendency—Remarks on it—The King's inclination to a reconciliation—Advancement of Sir Thomas Wentworth—The third Parliament—Notice of the speeches in it—Censure of the King's Declaration— Intolerance of the Puritanical party—Proceedings of Laud—Theological disputes—Conduct of the Parliament—Disorders in the Commons—Their contempt of the royal authority—Uproar at their adjournment— Dissolution of the third Parliament—Libels against Laud..... 424—481

CHAPTER XI.

1629—1631.

PAGE

The Court of Charles I.—Character of the King—The Queen—Laud—The expediency of ecclesiastics interfering with state affairs discussed—Character of the Marquis of Hamilton—Notice of his life—Character of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Lord Wentworth—Notice of his life—Consequence of Abbot's Primacy—The Lecturers—Their practices—Cognizance taken of them by the court—Instructions concerning them—Preaching—Its nature and uses—Popular errors on it—Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—Proceedings of Laud—Specimens of the devotions of the Lecturers—Prosecutions against them for sedition—Death of the Earl of Pembroke, Chancellor of Oxford—Election of Laud as Chancellor of that University—His munificence and patronage of literature—Birth of Charles II.—Laud officiates at the baptism—Revival of the Predestinarian Controversy—Dr. Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury—Libels against Laud—Story of Dr. Alexander Leighton—His book termed "Zion's Plea"—His degradation and punishment—Defence of Laud—Examination of the Star-Chamber proceedings—The consecration of the Church of St. Catherine Crèe—The nature of religious ceremonies—The Papists and Puritans—Remarks on Laud's conduct—Farther instances of his munificence ..... 481—549

CHAPTER XII.

1631—1633.

The Impropriations—Conduct of Laud—Dr. Peter Heylin's Sermon at St. Mary's, Oxford—Laud restrains the

PAGE

Impropriations—His proceedings at Oxford—He enlarges St. John's College—Promotes the repairs of St. ıl's Cathedral—Clamours of the Puritans—His government of the University—Enforces the statutes—Remarkable enthusiasm of a graduate—Combination of the Puritan faction at Oxford—Cognizance of three of the leaders—Their punishments—Impartiality of Laud—New revival of the Predestinarian controversy—Archbishop Usher of Ireland—Calumnies against Laud—Lord Wentworth proceeds to Ireland—Ecclesiastical affairs—Prosecution of the King's printers—Henry Sherfield—William Prynne—Notice of him and his writings—His seditious libels—His imprisonment—Proceedings relative to Chaplains and foreign service—The English congregation at Hamburgh—Salutary regulations by Laud—General remarks ..... 549—592

LIFE AND TIMES

OF

WILLIAM LAUD, D.D.

CHAPTER I.

1573—1603.

Birth of Laud—His family connections—Notices of them—Laud's education—Sent to St. John's College, Oxford—Dr. John Buckeridge—Notice of him—Is Laud's tutor—Reputation of Laud—His conduct at the University—Admitted into Holy Orders—Bishop Young—Principles of Laud—Calvinism, its nature and tendency—Its unhappy influence in the Church of England—The Puritans—Conduct of Laud—Remarks.

WILLIAM LAUD was born on the 7th day of October, 1573 [1], in the parish of St. Lawrence, Reading, a town of considerable importance in Berkshire, pleasantly situated on the river Kennet, and famous for its magnificent abbey, now in ruins, founded by Henry I. in 1126, and dedicated to St. James the Apostle [2]. He was the only son of William Laud,

[1] Wood, Athen. edit. 1721, vol. ii. col. 55. Laud's Diary, p. 1. fol. edit. 1695.

[2] Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, vol. i. folio, edit. 1682, p. 417. Lansdowne MSS. 721. "Abstract of the Lives of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, and Archbishop of York, and of William Laud, Bishop of London, and Archbishop of

by profession a clothier, and Lucy Webb, sister to Sir William Webb of the same county, of an ancient and respectable family, who filled the office of Lord Mayor of London in 1591[1]. His mother had been once married, previous to her marriage with his father: but of her first husband we know nothing, save his name and occupation. He was John Robinson, an eminent clothier and merchant in Reading, by whom she had several sons and daughters, all of them respectably connected in after life. A younger son entered into holy orders, and was Prebendary of Westminster and Archdeacon of Nottingham, and two of the daughters were married to clergymen of considerable reputation in the Church[2].

Though the man who was in future to rise to

Canterbury, written by Bishop Hacket and Dr. Heylin, who had been their Chaplains." It is there stated, "1573, William Laud was born at Reading, in Berkshire, his father a rich clothier, and his mother (widow to one Robinson, a clothier, by whom she had children) a sister to Sir William Webb, Lord Mayor of London in 1591. So he was not born of poor and obscure parents, *e faece plebis*, as many said." Sir William Webb, it appears, was a *salter*. Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 246.

[1] Laud's maternal relatives were natives of Reading. His mother was a daughter of John Webb, of whom we know nothing. John Webb was father of Sir William Webb. Wood. Athen. Oxon. by Dr. Bliss, vol. iii. col. 117. Fuller's English Worthies, folio, edit. 1662, p. 98.

[2] Dr. Cotsford and Dr. Layfield. Cyprianus Anglicus, or Life of Archbishop Laud, by his chaplain, Dr. Peter Heylin, fol. 1671, p. 42.

the highest ecclesiastical station in the Church, and to be alike distinguished for his munificence, his learning, and his genius, could not boast of noble birth or splendid alliance, yet his parents, while engaged in trade, were respectable in their station, and possessed of considerable wealth[1]. His father was most extensively engaged in manufactures, and we are informed that he kept "not only many looms in his house, but many weavers, spinners, and fullers; living in good esteem and reputation among his neighbours to the very last[2]." Of Laud's plebeian birth, however, his enemies afterwards took advantage, with that illiberality which is characteristic of little minds. When his actions were exhibited to his disadvantage by those whose extravagant pretensions he restrained, it was not

[1] I may here notice the puerile and false assertions of the Puritans. Neal (History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 156.) says, that "he was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, *upon the charitable donation* of Mr. White, Founder of Merchant Tailors' School." There is here a contemptuous way of talking of Sir T. White's scholarships, which marks the disposition of the party: besides, Laud was one year at College on his *own* expences, before he received the scholarship, an appointment so honourable to his promising talents. That violent fanatic, Prynne, also tells us, that he was born of "poor and obscure parents in a cottage," and in July, 1589, "he came a poor scholar to Oxford." Such were the low and scurrilous falsehoods retailed by the Puritans. Prynne's Breviat of the Life of Laud, folio, London, 1644, p. 1.

[2] Heylin, ut sup. p. 42. Laud's father died on the 11th of April, 1594, and his mother on the 24th of November, 1600. Diary, folio, ut sup. p. 1, 2. Lansdowne MSS. 721.

forgotten, that he who was then primate of all England was comparatively of humble origin; nor were those furious zealots satisfied with stating that he was the son of a respectable and wealthy tradesman, and abiding by the naked truth, but falsehoods were busily circulated, and his enemies, delineating his character to their liking, broadly asserted that he was sprung from the very dregs of the people [1].

[1] *E faece plebis.* Lord Brook, referred to by Heylin, who falsely asserted this not only of Laud, but of all the other Bishops. Republicanism, however, had then wrought its ferment, and the sectaries were rapidly advancing in their career of extravagance, rebellion, and blood. Lord Brook, however, ought to have been sparing of this insinuation on his part, inasmuch as he succeeded to the estate and honour in a very remote degree, his father, though a kinsman, being only keeper of Sir Fulk Greville's park. The son afterwards succeeded to the estate, Sir Fulk Greville having never been married. (Vide Peerage of England, London edit. 8vo. 1710, p. 67, 68.) Dr. Heylin, who was the chaplain and confidential friend of Laud, introduces an anecdote of the Archbishop on this subject. He says that he once found him in his garden at Lambeth walking to and fro in remarkable agitation, and though he did not, through delicacy, inquire the reason, the primate shewed him a paper, on which was printed a vile libel, which he had stopped at the press, representing him with "so base a parentage, as if he had been raked out of the dung-hill." He at the same time said, that "though he had not had the good fortune to be born a gentleman, yet he thanked God he had been born of honest parents, who lived in a plentiful condition, employed many poor people in their way, and left a good report behind them." As if ashamed, however, to have been impressed with those falsehoods which his sectarian enemies daily invented and retailed, and reflecting with satisfaction on the worth and respectability of his parents, his countenance resumed its wonted composure. "And

They chose to forget, that, even had it been the case, the more worthy was he of that eminence to which he had attained, since the man who could exalt himself solely by his genius and merit, was to be held in much greater reverence than he who, boasting of his noble lineage, had no other recommendation. They forgot that it is a remarkable feature of that country, about whose liberty they clamoured so violently, that the highest offices are open to every Briton, and that he whose genius has secured for him a well-earned reputation, is every way as noble when he is exalted, as the offspring of fortune and ancestral fame. But, without enlarging on these inconsistences, I may here remark, that the coincidence between Laud's situation, and that of some of his predecessors in the Church, as well as of some of those who were his ecclesiastical contemporaries, is very remarkable. I need not go to the Church of Rome for examples, though abundant proofs could be adduced from its history, that the best and the most celebrated of the Popes and dignitaries were men of humble origin,

thereupon," says Heylin, "I told him as presently as I durst, that Pope Sixtus V. as stout a Pope as ever wore the triple crown, but a poor man's son, did use familiarly to say, in contempt of such libels as frequently were made against him, that he was *domo natus illustri*, because the sun-beams passing through the broken walls and ragged roof, *illuminated* or *illustrated* every corner of that homely cottage in which he was born: with which facetiousness of that Pope, so applicable to the present occasion, he seemed very well pleased." Heylin, ut sup. p. 43, 44.

nay, some of them of menial extraction. In our own country, especially in the Church, before the Reformation, there are two notable examples, and the impartial pen of history will yet, perhaps, do justice to Thomas à Beckett, as it has done, it is pleasing to know, to the memory of Cardinal Wolsey. An Erasmus and a Luther on the continent owed nothing to birth or grandeur, nor yet did Abbott, Laud's predecessor in the See of Canterbury, who was nevertheless saved from such reproaches because he favoured the absurdities of the Puritans. It is needless, indeed, to enumerate those prior to the days of Laud, both ecclesiastics and laymen, who rose superior to the depressing influence of poverty, and whose minds, cast in other than plebeian mould, enabled them to surmount the difficulties opposed to them by humble birth and adverse fortune. Nor yet need I stop to animadvert on that most certain mark of a pusillanimous mind, which repines at the uncontrolable allotment of Providence, forgetting that heaven is impartial in its dispensations, and that all are equal in the eyes of Omnipotence, who "giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not." And who, after all, were those who thus dealt in slander and falsehood? It was too base, indeed, and too ignoble for the man of illustrious descent, who, animated with noble and virtuous principles, disdains the weak retort, and rather looks on him thus elevated to his own rank as a brother; nor were the nobles of that age, proud and haughty as

they were, actuated by such weakness: but those very persons who themselves were *humili nati*, who inherited the low and grovelling associations of their birth, who nevertheless felt their humiliation before Laud's vigorous mind, and who, because their fanaticism and absurdities had been restrained, endeavoured to excite among the people their dastardly and ignoble spirit of revenge[1].

During his infancy, Laud was subject to illness, to such a degree that he was not expected to live[2].

[1] A scandalous libel upon Laud appeared in a production entitled the *Scots Scouts Discoveries*, London, 1642. (Bishop Kennet, apud Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 117, *note*.) "His father was a clothier, his mother a spinster; he was from his cradle ordained to be a punisher of poor people, for he was born between the stocks and the cage, which a courtier one day chanced to speak of, whereupon his grace removed them thence, and pulled down his father's thatched house, and built a fair one in the place." But let us state the truth. The Puritan writer endeavours to insinuate, that Laud was ashamed of his birth, and that he built a house, in order to obliterate the recollection of the one in which he was born. The "fair house," therefore, which "his grace" built, was, as the Puritan writer knew well, *an alms-house*, which he endowed with *two hundred pounds per annum*. So much for Puritan veracity. I find, moreover, that in a small black letter tract, printed in quarto, 1641, which contains an account of Laud, although it is written by no professed friend, there is no notice taken of his connections, or any insinuations made on his birth. At all events, it is despicable in a modern writer to repeat this slander. Many of our present *noble* families were in the days of Laud *ignoble*. See Diary, and Fuller, book xi. p. 216, also the Topographical and Historical Account of Berkshire.

[2] Diary, p. 1. "In my infancy," says Laud, "I was in danger of death by sickness, &c."

Having recovered, he received the rudiments of his education at the free-school of his native town, at which he continued till he was sixteen years of age. It is recorded, that, while he was at school, he gave so many indications of his future eminence, that his master frequently said to him, that he hoped he would remember Reading School when he became a great man[1]. Little, however, is known of his juvenile years. In the month of July, 1589, he was sent to the University of Oxford, when only sixteen years of age, and was admitted a commoner of St. John's College, at that time under the superintendence of John Buckeridge, afterwards its President, and successively Bishop of Rochester and Ely. This distinguished prelate was born at Draycot, near Marlborough, in Wiltshire, and was the son of William Buckeridge, and Elizabeth, daughter of a gentleman named Keblewhyte, of Baseldon, and cousin to Sir Thomas White, founder of St. John's College, Oxford. He was educated at Merchant Taylors School, and in 1578 became scholar of St. John's, Oxford, and shortly afterwards Fellow of that society[2]. It was, perhaps, among the most fortunate events of Laud's early

[1] Lloyd's Memoires, folio, London, 1668, p. 225. "After a wonderful preservation in his infancy from a very sore fit of sickness, and a happy education in his childhood under a very severe schoolmaster, who, from his strange dreams, witty speeches, generous spirit, great apprehensions, and notable performances, promised him the greatness which he afterwards enjoyed."

[2] Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. col. 507.

life, that he was under the direction of this eminent man. Buckeridge was distinguished for his zealous attachment to the Church of England, particularly in opposition to the Puritans, who, notwithstanding the dislike entertained towards them by Queen Elizabeth, and the severity which she felt it necessary to exercise, had already broached that wild enthusiasm which was destined to break out with violence in the succeeding century. Laud was not unmindful of his venerable and learned preceptor in the days of his elevation, and Bishop Buckeridge has left behind him most honourable memorials of his zeal for apostolical and primitive truth [1].

[1] Godwin, Catal. Episc. p. 534. "Et tam scribendo, quam concionando veritatem Evangelicam haud segniter satagit propugnare." Of this worthy prelate it may also be proper to observe, that he was one of the most zealous defenders of the Protestant doctrines of the Church of England, in opposition to the dogmas of Rome. "A person he was," says Antony Wood, "of great gravity and learning, and one that knew as well as any other person of his time, how to employ the two-edged sword of the holy Scripture, of which he made good proof in the times succeeding, brandishing it on the one side against the Papists, and on the other against the Puritans and Non-conformists." And Dr. F. Godwin *(Comment. de Præsulibus Angliæ)* says, that he endeavoured most industriously to defend and propagate the true religion, by law established, as appears from his famous work, *De Potestate Papæ in Rebus temporalibus, sive in Regibus deponendis usurpata, adversus Robertum Cardinalem Bellarminum.* This elaborate work, which is a large quarto volume, was published in London, 1614. In his celebrated sermon preached at Whitehall, March 22, 1617, "touching prostration and kneeling in the worship of God," from Psalm xcv. 6, and

Under the superintendence of this excellent man, young Laud pursued his studies with the most indefatigable activity and success. After residing one year at St. John's College as commoner, in the month of June, 1590, he was chosen scholar of

in his "Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion," he completely vanquished the Scotch Presbyterians, four of whom had been honoured with an audience at Hampton Court, when he preached a sermon from Romans xiii. 5, on September 23, 1606. On that occasion the two Melvilles were present, famous for their turbulence, and fiery zeal for Calvinism. He published three other sermons,—a funeral one on Heb. iv. 7. the second, on the sixteenth verse of the same chapter, and the third on Heb. iv. 7. (1618.) The second sermon, which is a truly admirable one, is to be found at the end of Bishop Andrews' Sermons, folio, London, edit. 1661. This prelate was a benefactor to St. John Baptist's College, Oxford, where his picture, says Kennet, (anno 1717) is now preserved on the south wall of the common hall. "Dr. J. Buckeridge, episcop. Eliensis altaris suæ capellæ vestimenta Phrygii operis pulvinaria, pallium, calicem, &c. collegio-legavit, ann. 1631. Hic episcopus donavit 500 lb. terris quibusdam redimendis quarum proventus omnibus et singulis tum sociis tum scholaribus ex æqua dividerentur, ann. 1631." Two extracts from letters written by the unfortunate Earl of Essex (to whom Bishop Buckeridge was chaplain) to the Lord Keeper Puckering; the one dated 17th Feb. 1594, and the other 12th Jan. 1595, will be found in Strype's Annals, vol. iv. p. 245, 246. and in Wood, vol. ii. col. 509, 510. The exact date of Bishop Buckeridge's death is not known, save that he was buried in the parish church of Bromley, in Kent, the manor of which belongs to the see of Rochester, on the 31st of May, 1631. Wood, ut supra; Strype's Annals, vol. iv.; also Fuller's Church History, cent. xvii. London edit. folio, 1655. "By the temper of the tutor we may see that of the scholar." Lansdowne MSS. 721.

that society[1]. We are informed, by Dr. Heylin[2], that he was held in so great estimation in his own native town, "partly by his own proficiency, and partly by the good esteem which was had of his father," that he was nominated, by the mayor and others, a scholar of St. John's, "according to the constitutions of Sir Thomas White, the honourable and sole founder of it;" for, though that munificent patron of letters had originally intended Merchant Taylors School in London as the chief place whence his scholarships should be supplied, yet he was a man of too liberal a mind to make his munificence comparatively so exclusive, and therefore he instituted seven fellowships unconnected with that establishment, assigning two to Coventry, two to Bristol, two to Reading, and one to Tunbridge. In 1593, Laud was admitted Fellow of St. John's, and in June, 1594, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts[3]. In the years 1596-7, he himself informs us, that he was overtaken by a severe illness[4]. After his recovery, he proceeded Master of Arts, which degree he received in July 1598, when he became grammar reader, but relapsed into sickness towards the end of the same year[5].

[1] Laud's Diary, p. 1. Lansdowne MSS. ut sup.

[2] Life of Laud, ut sup. p. 45.

[3] Diary, ut sup.

[4] Anno 1596, "I had a great sickness," and another, 1597, Diary, ut sup.

[5] Diary, ut sup. Wood, however, asserts, (Fasti. vol. i. col. 144,) that he became B.A. July 1, 1594, and M.A. June 26, 1598. That industrious writer has confounded the months.

Respecting Laud's general conduct while at the University, we are informed by Wood[1], that he was "at that time esteemed by all that knew him, (being little in stature) a very forward, confident, and zealous person." It is not at all improbable, that he felt much of that rashness and buoyancy natural to youth, which would be more particularly liable to excitement on account of the influence of the Puritan faction in the University, whose enthusiasm it was impossible not to despise. But it does not follow, though his enemies, who eagerly caught at every thing to suit their purpose, endeavoured afterwards to make it appear, since he was uniformly the same man from his birth to his death, that he gave any extraordinary signs of haughty demeanour. It is to be remarked, that the testimony now before us is on the authority of the Puritans, and of those violent supralapsarians whom he afterwards so successfully opposed; who themselves were not too scrupulous in veracity, either in public or private, as is notorious to every one who knows any thing of the crafty and designing methods which they adopted to accomplish their own ends[2]; and it will be much more apparent to him who impartially peruses the volumes of Neal, the Puritan historian[3], or any of those contradictions repeated by Messrs. Bogue and Bennet, in their History of Dissenters. Nevertheless, it may have so happened

[1] Wood, vol. iii. col. 117. 122.

[2] For example, in the affair about the famous Lambeth Articles.

[3] Neal's History of the Puritans, vols. ii. and iii. ch. 5.

that Laud did conduct himself haughtily (at least *reservedly)* towards the Puritan faction in the University, nor am I at all inclined to exhibit him as destitute of any of the failings of humanity, or superior to the sallies of youth, before his mind was matured by experience and reflection. But it is unfair to allow sectarian prejudice so completely to obscure common sense, as to seize on the slightest peculiarities of youth, and fasten them on the actions of maturer years, as indications of what some men choose to call tyranny, and others popery. And thus much must be said of Laud, while only a private member of the University, that he then laid the foundation of his future eminence; that he was held in no small estimation; and that the fame which he acquired in all his public appearances is honourable to his genius, his industry, and his learning.

On the fourth of January, 1600, he was admitted into deacon's orders, by Dr. Young, Bishop of Rochester, and, on the 5th of April, 1601, he was ordained a priest by the same prelate[1]. We are informed that this prelate, "finding his study raised above the systems and opinions of the age, upon the noble foundation of the fathers, councils, and the ecclesiastical historians, early presaged, that, if he lived, he would be an instrument of restoring the church from the narrow and private principles of modern times, to the more enlarged,

[1] Diary, p. 2. Lloyd's Memoires, p. 225. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 45. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 117, 118. et seq.

liberal, and public sentiments of the apostolic and primitive ages[1]." Nor was Bishop Young mistaken in his judgment, though he well knew that it would be a task of no small difficulty,—a task, indeed, not likely to be accomplished without bloodshed. For, after the English Reformation of religion, notions had been entertained by many persons in the Church, not only subversive of its constitution, but highly detrimental to the safety and well-being of the state. The discipline of Geneva, and the doctrine of expediency, as laid down by John Calvin, who has the merit, if merit it be, of contriving and introducing a new system of ecclesiastical polity, and who, moreover, has the still more questionable merit of discovering in the sacred Scriptures certain doctrines which exhibit the Deity not in the most favourable light, as he himself was forced to confess, when with grief he admits it to be an *horribile decretum*:—this discipline had led many astray from the maxims of primitive truth and order, and the notions of expediency as to the Church and its visibility, had engendered a lamentable callousness towards that very Church of which they all professed to be sincere members. Forgetting that the Church of Christ is one and undivided,—forgetting that the Saviour himself declared, "my kingdom is not of this world,"—and forgetting, too, that this union is not solely a spiritual union, composed at the same time of outward

[1] Lloyd's Memoires, &c. p. 225, 226.

heterogeneous masses, but is, in truth, both a spiritual and a temporal union, no limits were assigned to the extravagances of fancy, and no safeguard adopted for the preservation of that Church, the doctrines of which Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer, had sealed with their blood. But the axiom which Laud subsequently assumed, though doubtless sneered at by Dissenters, is strictly true, that the Church must be guarded both against Rome and Geneva—that a Church founded on the Apostles, and not on Christ, is the Roman and the Genevan rock—but that the Church must have a more solid basis, or it has no foundation at all; and that, though it must be built on the foundation of the *apostles* and *prophets*, Jesus Christ himself must be the chief corner-stone. There were, therefore, only two positions,—either that the Church must be a regularly organized body, which, though a voluntary association, acknowledges Christ for its head, or it must not; there must either be systems of authority and regulation, or there must be anarchy and confusion; it must, in short, either be like a well-governed and well-organised kingdom, to which it is compared in the Holy Scriptures[1], or it must be so ill-regulated, as that all its members may literally do that which is right

[1] 1 Cor. i. 10. Ephes. iii. 4. 7. 14. v. 23—30. 1 Tim. vi. 34. Heb. xii. 22. Matt. xvi. 18, 19. Col. i. 18. Rom. xiii. 1. xv. 6. xvi. 17. 1 Pet. ii. 13. 1 John xvii. 17. 1 Cor. xii. 13. 27. Gal. iii. 28. 1 Tim. iv. 6. vi. 4. 20, 21. 2 Tim. i. 13. Phil. i. 27. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. Jude 19.

in their own eyes. The former, then, was the position of the well-wishers of the Church of England, the latter that of those who were preparing the way for its overthrow: the former was advocated by those who defended order and primitive truth, the latter by those who were on the point of holding out the right hand of fellowship to novelty and fanaticism. Laud hesitated not for a moment to decide; and his memory does truly deserve well of the Church of England, since he so early avowed himself the bold defender of its constitutions.

Nor was it long before Laud had an opportunity of displaying his sentiments. Upon this subject, however, it is necessary to go a little into detail, more especially as it will serve to explain the opposition which he encountered. During the Marian persecution, as it is termed, Laurence Humphries, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, having been deprived of his fellowship for his attachment to the Reformation, retreated to the city of Zurich, in Switzerland, then famous as the birth-place and residence of Zuinglius. Associating with that Reformer, and maintaining a constant correspondence with Calvin and his friends at Geneva, he became so much attached to the Calvinistic tenets, that, on his return to England after the death of Mary, he studied to promote them with all his influence. "The best that could be said of him," says Dr. Heylin[1], "by one who commonly speaks well of

[1] Life of Laud, p. 46.

all that party, is, that he was *a moderate and conscientious nonconformist*[1]." As he was a man of very great learning[2], on his return from his exile he was presented by Queen Elizabeth to the Presidency of Magdalen College, and was also appointed Professor of Theology, and Vice-chancellor of the University. The duties of this office he discharged till 1596, about which time it is supposed he died[3]. With these advantages, his influence was great in the University, nor was he idle in disseminating the tenets which he had imbibed while in exile. Hence, through the influence of Dr. Humphries, Magdalen College became a nursery of non-conformity, and those students were only noticed who were zealous supporters of the dogmas of Calvin. It would appear that he coincided with some of that school who positively deny that Papists are Christians, or that there can be any

[1] Fuller's Church History, lib. ix. p. 234.

[2] "He was master," says Heylin, "of a pure Latin style." Heylin, ut sup.

[3] The year of this learned man's death, however, is uncertain. Fuller, in his Church History of Britain, (lib. ix. p. 233, 234. London, folio, 1655.) says, "Here I am at a loss for the death of Laurence Humphries, but confident I hit the *but*, though miss the *mark*, at about this time, (1596). He was a conscientious and moderate Nonconformist, (condemned for *lukewarm* by such as were *scalding hot*) Dean of Winchester, and Master of Magdalene College in Oxford, to which he bequeathed a considerable sum of gold, left in a chest, not to be opened unless some great necessity urged it thereto."

good in their corrupt and degenerate Church[1]. For his anti-popish zeal he was jocularly surnamed Papisto-Mastix.

Dr. Humphries was succeeded by Dr. John Holland, Rector of Exeter College, who, though a man of much greater moderation, was strongly inclined to the tenets of the Puritans. But, zealous as Dr. Humphries had been against every thing, whether good or bad, which was observed in the Church of Rome, it would appear that he found an active assistant in the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity[2]. Yet even he was thought to be deficient in zeal; and accordingly, Sir Francis Walsingham, the principal Secretary of State, who favoured the Non-conformists, founded a new theological lecture in the University[3]. The reader of this lecture was required to make short annotations on the holy Scriptures, in order that the students might be induced to pursue their researches[4]. Whitgift was then primate, whose character for mildness, firmness, and moderation, is most conspicuous in those troublous times. By his judicious conduct he had

[1] Heylin, p. 46. "He did not only stock his college with such a generation of Non-conformists, as could not be wormed out in many years after his decease, but sowed in the divinity schools such seeds of Calvinism, and laboured to create in the younger students such a strong hate against the Papists, as if nothing but divine truth were to be found in the one, and nothing but abominations in the other."

[2] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 46.

[3] Heylin, ut sup. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 597.

[4] Collier, ut sup.

brought over many Roman Catholics to the Church of England; but he was completely unsuccessful in his attempts to restrain the enthusiasm of the Puritans[1]. Before his promotion, he had engaged in dispute with the celebrated Puritan leader, Thomas Cartwright of Cambridge, and had written an answer to the Admonition of that zealot; to which Cartwright wrote a reply. Whitgift rejoined in the following year, (1571), in a work entitled, "A Defence of the Answer." "To which," observes Collier, "Cartwright offered nothing, but retired from the field, and left the enemy possessed of all the entire marks of victory[2]." Walsingham, who had already signalised himself by his opposition to the subscription of three articles, which had been enacted "for the better increase of learning in the inferior ministers, and for the more diligent preaching and catechizing[3]," and which are in themselves truly admirable, as he was a resolute friend to the Puritans, and had, besides, engaged in other disputes, in which he always advocated the cause of his dissenting friends, instituted this lecture not so much out of a pure desire to foster and encourage learning, as to make it subservient to the schemes of the Puritans, and to irritate and insult the fallen Roman Catholics[4]. And that this might be the more

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 684.

[2] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 537.

[3] Register, Whitgift, Part I. fol. 97. 131. 162.

[4] Strype's Annals of Queen Elizabeth, vol. ii.; also Lives of Archbishops Parker and Whitgift. Collier, Eccles. Hist. vol. ii.

effectually promoted, the celebrated Dr. John Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, who afterwards distinguished himself in the dispute held at Hampton Court, before King James, in 1603-4, was appointed to the lectureship. Reynolds, though now a violent enemy to Popery, and to the hierarchy in general, had been in his youth on the continent, and, during his residence there was devoted in his attachment to Popery; but having been drawn over to the Church of England by his brother, who himself recanted[1], he fell into the other extreme, and resolved

p. 597. Wood, Hist. and Antiq. Oxon. Heylin, ut sup. The last writer says, that Walsingham was "a man of great abilities in the schools of policy, an extreme hater of the Popes and Church of Rome, and no less favourable unto those of the Puritan faction." It would appear that the lecture was well attended by the younger students; but its object was censured by many, and even by some of the moderate Puritans, who, suspecting Walsingham's motives, "ventured to say, that the pretence of propagating truth, was only a colour to convey Walsingham's sacrilege out of sight. For this gentleman, it seems, during the vacancy of the see of Oxford, had lopped the revenues." Collier, ut sup.

[1] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 47. Dr. Reynolds' brother, William Reynolds, had been as resolute a Protestant as he was a Papist. A mutual disputation took place between them on the articles of their faith, which ended in the Papist turning Protestant, and the Protestant to the Church of Rome, in which he died. "This singular occurrence," says Fuller, "gave the occasion to an excellent copy of verses, concluding with this distich:

"Quod genus hoc pugnæ est? ubi victus gaudet uterque?
Et simul alteruter se superâsse dolet."

to exalt himself among the Puritan enthusiasts. He was, accordingly, high in favour with Sir Francis Walsingham, who consulted him on every occasion, and also with the Earl of Leicester, Chancellor of the University, who, from political motives, was sometimes inclined to co-operate with the malcontents [1]. Reynolds was a man of great learning, and extensive reading, and he was no less remarkable for his prodigious memory [2]. His private character, too, was most exemplary and pious, and he appears to have been very solicitous about the soundness of the doctrines which he taught [3].

[1] "Divinity," says Collier, "had now a new face at Oxford, and the first reformation was reformed away in great measure;" ut sup.

[2] Heylin, ut sup.; Fuller, ut sup. p. 48; Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Neal's History of the Puritans.

[3] There seem to be different opinions concerning Dr. Reynolds. Collier says, "As for Dr. Reynolds, he made it his business to read against the hierarchy, and to weaken the authority of bishops." Fuller, on the other hand, asserts, that he, of all the Puritans, was most conformable in his practice to the Church of England. "His disaffection," says he, "to the discipline established in England, was not so great as some bishops did suspect, or as some Nonconformists did believe. No doubt he desired the abolishing of some ceremonies, for the care of the conscience of others, to which in his own practice he did willingly submit, constantly wearing hood and surplice, and kneeling at the Sacrament." In opposition to this testimony, however, respecting the ecclesiastical habit, Heylin asserts, (p. 47), that "Dr. Reynolds had the confidence to appear in the conference at Hampton Court [in 1603] in his Turkey gown, and therefore may be thought to have worn no other in the University." It is a singular fact, at the same time, that Dr. Reynolds on his death-

Under the auspices of those and other leaders of the Puritans, the tenets of Geneva were making rapid progress in the University, engendering the most novel speculations about the Church, and producing a general carelessness about its constitution, which threatened to sap its very foundation. Forgetting the moderation and admirable caution of the great men under whose auspices the reformation of the Church of England had been conducted, they seemed as if they had themselves determined to commence a new reformation, while at the same time they admitted, that the line of demarcation between the Reformed Church and that of Rome was broad and insurmountable. Nor was their policy the less crafty than their general conduct; for since they well knew that, were they to make any notorious innovation at once, they would be punished by the civil and ecclesiastical power as disturbers of the peace of the realm, their sole hope lay in biassing the minds of the students in the University, over whom they were placed; while, at the same time, they merely corresponded about their differences with their friends among the laity who were in power and influence. Now it was, indeed, that the doctrines of the Church of England, founded

bed, at his own earnest request, received absolution, according to the form of the Church of England. "He received it," says Fuller, "from Dr. Holland, [the successor of Dr. Humphries, who was himself inclined, as I have already remarked, to Nonconformity,] whose hand he affectionately kissed, in expression of the joy he received thereby."

on holy Scripture, were not only disputed, but positively denied. The opinions of Calvin respecting predestination, reprobation, election, and all the other kindred dogmas, were zealously maintained, although their defenders might have known that, besides looking in vain for Calvin's *horribile decretum* in the holy Scriptures, the fathers, with the exception of St. Augustine, and his two disciples, Prosper and Fulgentius, never conceived such tenets, so far as individuals are concerned; and perhaps in this view even St. Augustine himself may not be conceded[1]. The doctrine of Scripture and of the Church respecting regeneration in infant baptism was denied, as was also the doctrine of the Church respecting the holy Eucharist. It was absolutely denied, that either of these sacred rites had any efficacy in man's salvation. The article in the Apostle's Creed respecting Christ's local descent into hell, asserted in the Convocations of the Church in 1552 and 1562, was disclaimed as erroneous, merely, as Dr. Heylin well remarks, "because repugnant to the fancies of some foreign divines, though they were in dispute among themselves about the meaning of it[2]." The episcopal government of the Church was held to be against the

[1] Prosper confesses, that they who condemned Pelagianism, rejected St. Augustine's notion as a mere novelty; and that Father himself says, "It is the height of madness and injustice to hold any person guilty because he did not that which he could not do."

[2] See the great work, Bishop Pearson on the Creed, folio.

ecclesiastical constitution of the apostolic and primitive times, and this, too, by men who were conversant with the apostles and fathers. Presbyters and bishops were held to be synonymous, and the fallacious doctrine of expediency in church government was assumed, it being asserted, that the apostles did not trouble themselves about ecclesiastical polity; the doctrine of the visibility of the Church was disclaimed, and sectarian conventicles were held to be as scriptural as the Church, though these, it was evident, were all founded on the visions of enthusiasts, and false positions erroneously drawn from holy Scripture. The Pope was furiously declared to be Antichrist; the ordination of the Church of Rome was pronounced invalid, as part of "the mark of the beast." These and other such opinions were "as positively and magisterially maintained, as if they had been the chief articles of the Christian faith[1]." The public services of the Church, according to the Book of Common Prayer, were either carelessly performed, or neglected; offence was taken at every sacred rite and ceremony which had been practised since the days of the apostles. "In a word," to quote from Heylin[2] on this very subject, "the books of Calvin made the rule by which all men were to square their writings, his only word (like the *ipse dixit* of Aristotle) admitted as the sole canon to which they were to

[1] Heylin, p. 47.

[2] See also the Preface to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.

frame and conform their judgments, and in comparison to whom, the ancient fathers of the Church, men of renown, and the glory of their several times, must be held contemptible: and to offend against this canon, or to break this rule, was esteemed a more unpardonable crime, than to violate the apostles' canons, or dispute the doctrines and determinations of any of the four first General Councils; so that it might have proved more safe for any man, in such a general deviation from the rules and dictates of this Church, to have been looked upon as an heathen or a publican, than an anti-Calvinist."

Let me not be misunderstood, in the preceding remarks, as if I have given only a partial view of the lamentable state to which ecclesiastical discipline was reduced towards the last years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Church of England has been justly called the great bulwark of the Protestant Reformation; and why, it is asked, has it received this glorious appellation? Not certainly because, in its resolution to separate from Rome, it was actuated, in the persons of its venerable reformers, by mean and sinister motives, for they nobly sealed their attachment to the truth with their blood; nor yet, by trampling upon every sacred and venerable institution, as if, after having been long in one extreme, it was determined to run into the other, and, by making a total divestment of faith and sense, reduce religion to a pyebald exterior, presenting no counteraction to the effusions of fanaticism and ignorance, no means to preserve true

religion within its pale, apart from the individual opinions of men, even supposing that its clergy were simultaneously to become degenerate; nor yet by resigning the practice of the Church universal in all ages, and closing with novelty, as if anxious for new discoveries. Novelty in theology is the certain indication of error; nor would the Church have appeared, as it does to this day, venerable in its institutions, and simple in its ritual, had it so far wandered from the right path. But Elizabeth was now in the decline of life, and the death of the unfortunate Essex had reduced her vigorous mind to a state of imbecility. Enthusiasm was, in consequence, making rapid progress at the accession of James. The Calvinism of Geneva had disgusted that monarch in Scotland, insolently as it was advocated by the Melvilles and their associates. It was highly necessary, therefore, that James should take measures, on his accession to the English throne, to oppose that insolent fanaticism which had been secretly kindling in the minds of the people for half a century, and disturbing the peace of the Church by every new importation of zealots from the school of Geneva. Nor, while thus speaking of the dogmas of Calvin, and the grand features of Presbyterianism, would I be thought wanting in respect to those who differed from us. I speak of *systems* only, not of *individuals*, excepting so far as their public conduct is concerned. Our Church has been incessantly attacked, but we are unwilling to retaliate, while we know the sure ground on

which we tread. "Having a sure and certain word of prophecy, unto which it will be well for us to take heed," we reject the fallacious doctrine of expediency, and assert with confidence the constant visibility and oneness of the Church in all ages, from the days of its Divine Founder. Nor need the authorities on which our positions are grounded, be required of us: even Calvin himself could not reconcile them to his own opinions [1]. To the merit of that reformer, indeed, I willingly bear testimony: his learning is indisputable, he was a great man; but the same spirit which prompted him to pursue the mild, though mistaken, Servetus to the stake, was too amply inherited by his disciples both in England and Scotland, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; by which the frenzy of a stern republicanism overthrew the government of the land, and, even after it was re-established, involved the northern part of the island in rebellion and bloodshed. The opinions he taught, as he conceived them to be derived from the Scriptures, require other proof than that which he furnishes: and those do greatly err, who believe them to be the doctrines of the Church of England. That Church, it is consolatory to know, takes a much higher authority, and by the holy Scriptures it stands or falls.

Such, then, was the state of the Church in the years 1602-3, when Laud made his first public ap-

[1] Calvin, Institut. lib. iv. cap. iv. § 1.

pearance. Many of the original non-conformist leaders were now dead, but some of them still survived. They wanted not, however, successors to tread in the same path. The celebrated Abbott[1], afterwards primate, and Prideaux, who succeeded Drs. Holland and Reynolds as theological professors, taught the tenets of their predecessors, and warmly attached themselves to the Puritans[2]. In the year 1602, Laud read the divinity lecture in St. John's College, founded by Mrs. Maye[3], and received the general applause of that society. In this lecture, he boldly advocated those opinions which he ever afterwards maintained. It would appear that he had long beheld, with deep regret, the dangerous tendency of the enthusiasm of the times; and he resolved, though he stood alone, to raise his solitary voice in defence of the doctrines of the Church of England. He had studied the fathers with peculiar care, and had made himself master of the constitution of the Church, as set forth during the apostolic and primitive times in the canons of the general councils. His theological studies had been founded on the sacred canon, carefully perusing at the same time the comments and interpretations of the fathers; and his vigorous

[1] He was then Master of University College, and Vice-chancellor of the University.

[2] Original Manuscript of Dr. Heylin, Lansdowne MSS. 721.

[3] He was the last who read that lecture. Diary, p. 2; Heylin, p. 49; Lloyd's Memoirs, p. 226; Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 121.

mind enabled him at once to perceive the errors which the ancient heretics and modern schismatics had imbibed, by their attempts at private interpretation of the canon of inspiration: a practice which is unhappily too prevalent among their successors in the present times. He was not to be led astray by the names of men, however great and renowned, and he was determined to oppose those novelties in theology, which were daily becoming more prevalent. Fortified as he was by the canons of the Church, and, above all, by holy Scripture, he resolved "to hold fast the form of sound words" which had been delivered; and, solitary as he stood in this perilous undertaking, to try his fortune in the work, and to leave the issue thereof unto God, by whom "Paul's planting and Apollo's watering do receive the increase[1]."

On no subject, perhaps, has there been greater dispute than on the meaning of the Articles of the Church of England. While the zealous Puritan rejected them *in toto*, both because they were not sufficiently Calvinistic to suit his notions, and because they contained that form of ecclesiastical polity which he abhorred; the Calvinist, on the one hand, who wished not to leave the Church, discovered them to be thoroughly Calvinistic, and was

[1] Dr. Heylin, p. 48. "Nor would he run precipitately into common opinions, (for common opinions many times are but common errors); as Calderinus is reported to have gone to mass, because he would not break company with the rest of his friends."

content; the Arminian loudly asserted, on the other hand, that they contained the doctrines and tenets of Arminius, and cordially subscribed to them. Such was the procedure in the time of Laud, and such it is in the present day. Now, keeping out of view the Puritan and the modern Dissenter as completely hopeless subjects, or, in other words, as men beyond the reach of argument or reason, nothing is more evident than that both the Calvinist and Arminian are decidedly wrong. The Articles are expressed with such clearness, that he who candidly peruses them, and is gifted with an ordinary share of reason, cannot fail to perceive their meaning, and to acquiesce at once in their decisions; but it is most absurd to say that they are founded upon, or that they favour, the individual theories either of John Calvin or of James Arminius. A division has indeed taken place in the Church in modern times, and an unaccountable zeal has now decided that the orthodox clergy are the Calvinists: those who deny Calvin's tenets being of course anti-evangelical. Yet, if the test of evangelism be the rash assumptions of the predestinarian, most unquestionably that evangelism rests upon a feeble foundation, and they do greatly err whose zeal is thus permitted to triumph over their reason. But the Church of England at once disdains a blind veneration for any frail and erring mortal, however great or excellent in the eyes of his fellow men. That the Articles of the Church are not Calvinistic, I hope to shew in another place; and that they are

not Arminian, I here assert, inasmuch as the tenets of Arminius were not propagated until a long time after these Articles were compiled [1]. But if by Arminian (for language is arbitrary, and it matters not what may be the name, however odious that name may be to the descendants of the champions of the Covenant in the north)—if, I say, by Arminian, it be meant, that the Church of England in its Articles, *not* in its clergy, rejects and disapproves a rash inquiry into those "secret things which belong unto the Lord our God," if it rejects the *horribile decretum* of Calvin, on whose shewing, to adopt the language of John Wesley, "the elect will be saved, do what they will; the reprobate will be damned, do what they can," and in all its public ministrations, formularies, articles, rituals, and homilies, asserts, that every man, without exception, who hears the glad sound of the gospel, may become a partaker of the same, and a true member of Christ's body, as he did become in infancy by "the washing of water and the renewing of the Holy Spirit,"—if, in short, it is the constant theme of the Church that "he who cometh unto God, will in no wise be cast out," and if its ministers are commanded to call on all men *every where* to repent, without any reservation of election or reprobation,

[1] James Van Harmen, or Arminius, was the disciple of Beza, and minister at Amsterdam. He was at first educated in rigid Calvinism, but on reflection, he expressed doubts as to that system in 1591. The Articles were compiled almost *half a century* previous.

then let it be called Arminian, for such is the doctrine of Holy Scripture. And if the Episcopal government of the Church be taken into account, in opposition to the Calvinistic system of ecclesiastical parity, by which the unedifying sight has often been exhibited, of preachers at war with one another, without a head to control them, or to impose on them ecclesiastical obedience, then let it be Arminian, it matters not, since the polity which is enjoined and practised, has been that of the Church in every age, since the days of its divine Founder.

When Laud, therefore, stepped boldly forth to vindicate the Articles and Constitution of the Church, against the fancies and enthusiasm of her Puritan members, those Articles "had been wrested from the literal and grammatical sense, to fit them to the sense of particular persons," and "a different construction had been put upon them from that which had been the true and genuine meaning of the men that framed them, and the authority which had confirmed them." It was either in this lecture, or in some other academical exercise, that Laud asserted and maintained the perpetual visibility of the Church, as derived from the apostles by the Romish Church, and therein continued (as in the Churches of the East and South) until the period of the Reformation[1]. This lecture gave great offence to the Puritans of the University. Abbot,

[1] It is uncertain whether it was in this lecture or not; but the conjecture is probably right that it was. Heylin, p. 49. Diary, p. 2. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 121.

the vice-chancellor, who was secretly jealous of him, and who liked not to be surpassed in learning by a person who was under his control, was of a different opinion,—which, indeed, was natural, considering his attachment to the Puritan faction. He asserted, on the other hand, that there was no definite visibility of the Church; and, forgetting the axiom, that a corrupt Church may be nevertheless a true one, so far as ordination is concerned, out of his zealous abhorrence to popery, he yet traced a visibility from the time of the apostles to the sect called Berengerians, the followers of Berengerius, who flourished in the eleventh century[1], from them to the Albigenses, or Waldenses, so called from the city Albi, or the district of Albigeois, in the south of France, supposed by Toplady and others *to have been the uncorrupted descendants of the first Christians,* but whose creed was pronounced by the Council of Tours, A.D. 1163, to be "a damnable heresy, long since sprung up in the territory of Toulouse[2]." From them, again, to the Wickliffites, or Lollards, the followers of Wickliffe, the proto-reformer of England, and the "morning-star of the English Reformation," from

[1] Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 558—560. Milner's Church Hist. vol. iii. p. 289—291.

[2] Mr. Hume (History of England, vol. ii. chap. xi.) observes, that the decree of this council so subjected them to persecution, that "those sectaries, though the most innocent and inoffensive of mankind, were exterminated with all the circumstances of extreme violence and barbarity."

them to the Hussites, whose leader, John Huss, adopted Wickliffe's opinions, for which he suffered martyrdom in the year 1415 [1], and from them to the days of Martin Luther and John Calvin. This fanciful hypothesis, which Abbot assumed, was completely refuted by Laud; which so enraged the former, and excited so much mutual disgust, that an enmity took place, which ever afterwards subsisted between them [2]: and so violent was Abbot's antipathy to his opponent, that he embraced every opportunity of displaying his opposition, which happened more than once in after life [3].

[1] Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. vol. iv. p. 384; vol. v. p. 117. Milner, vol. iv. p. 279, 280. 597.

[2] Heylin, p. 49. Original Manuscript of Dr. Heylin, Lansdowne MSS. 721. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 440. "Abbot wrote a work on the subject, entitled, 'A Treatise of perpetual Visibility and Succession of the True Church in all Ages.' London, 4to. 1624. He was then in the see of Canterbury. His name is not at the work, but only his family arms, impaled with those of Canterbury." Dr. Heylin, who, by the way, was no friend to Abbot, remarks on this work, "This being his opinion also when he lived in Oxford, he thought it a great derogation to his parts and credit, that any man should dare to maintain the contrary, and thereupon conceived a strong grudge against Laud, which no tract of time could either abolish or diminish." It would appear, however, that some differences had taken place between him and Laud as early as 1597.

[3] Abbot, says an author, conceived a very strong prejudice against Mr. Laud, which no time could either lessen or destroy. Although Abbot was a great and good man, it is certain that he entertained a violent hatred to Laud, and it so far influenced him, as to make him in after life give Laud a most unfavourable cha-

That Abbot, if he defended the visibility of the Church at all, was wrong in his positions, and fanciful in his illustrations, is sufficiently evident from the incongruous nature of those sects amongst whom he traced that visibility. For, though Berengerius was Archdeacon of Angers, he died in the communion of the Romish Church, after making a public recantation of his opinions, both at Paris and Rome [1]. His followers, therefore, had no regularly ordained pastors, and, besides, they were

racter, which could only result from a recollection of the opposition he had received. In the Archbishop's narrative concerning his disgrace at court, written by himself, (Rushworth, vol. i. p. 434, &c.) he talks about "knowing in general the disposition of the man," p. 439; and again, "about the dispute between the King and himself," Bishop Laud is designated "the only inward counsellor with Buckingham, sitting with him sometimes privately whole hours, and feeding his humours with malice and spite. His life in Oxford was to pick quarrels in the lectures of the public readers, and to advertise them to the then Bishop of Durham, that he might fill the ears of King James with discontent against the honest men that took pains in their places, and settled the truth, which he called Puritanism, in their auditors. He made it his work to see what books were on the press, and to look over epistles dedicatory, and prefaces to the reader, to see what faults might be found," p. 440. That this is over-coloured there can be no doubt, when we recollect Abbot's feelings towards Laud, whom he secretly charged as helping to procure his disgrace.

[1] He died, moreover, firm in his belief of transubstantiation. He maintained the doctrines of the famous Duns Scotus, surnamed Erigena. Although the Church of Rome in his time (1058) had not adopted any particular doctrine on the Eucharist, his heresy was condemned.

in dispute amongst themselves about the eucharist, all agreeing that the elements were not essentially changed, though some asserted that they were partly changed. "Some admitted a change in part, and others an entire change, with this restriction, that to those who communicated unworthily the elements were changed back again[1]." The Waldenses had for their apostle Peter Waldo, or Valdo, a merchant of Lyons, who, whether he gave his name to them or not, never received the ordination of a priest. It is not my intention here to enter into the discussion of this important subject in reference to those sectaries, nevertheless I may remark, that they also were not agreed among themselves on certain doctrines. They held various opinions about infant baptism, and they asserted "that the sacraments are signs of the holy things, visible forms of the invisible grace; and that it is good for the faithful to use those signs or visible forms; but they are not essential to salvation." The same tenets were held by the Wickliffites or Lollards, the Hussites, the Calvinists, and the Puritans, of the sixteenth century, as they are yet held by the Dissenters of almost every description. Sects which entertained those vague and confused notions on the holy sacraments, have always framed equally crude ideas about the office of the priesthood; and, in truth, they had no regular canonical ordination, and cared little about the unity of the Church, as taught in

[1] Williams' Dictionary of all Religions, p. 63.

holy Scripture. Now, it certainly is the doctrine of the Church of England, that the sacraments are not mere rites or memorials, (for we can conceive no opinion more unworthy of institutions set apart by the Saviour himself,) but are, in very truth, on their right reception, the ordinary means by which men obtain salvation. But the opposite opinion was held by the Puritans, and sanctioned by Abbot, on which account they totally misinterpreted those simple but sacred symbols, and rested more on visionary themes about faith and other doctrines. The view which Abbot took of the visibility of the Church, therefore, struck at the very root of that Church of which he was a member, and still farther tended to promote the spirit of dangerous enthusiasm. It went far to overthrow that union and consistency which are necessary for the peace and well-being of the state ecclesiastical, and was, in a word, completely congenial to the views of the non-conformists.

The question has been often sneeringly asked by the Romanists, where was the Protestant Church before Luther? This question was common in the days of Laud, nor was it at all answered with satisfaction by the Puritan divines, who seldom abode by the argument, but went on to a discussion of certain doctrines, and spirituality in matters of faith. Now, that these are all right in themselves there can be no question, still there was another way in which the Romanists might be silenced, and the catholic doctrine of the visibility of the Church

maintained. This position, therefore, Laud assumed, and he managed the subject with the ability of a master. While the positions of Abbot and others, who took refuge among the continental sectaries, were easily overthrown by the priests and Jesuits; they were at once staggered by the arguments of a more powerful opponent, who revelled not in an enthusiasm which they had long despised, but successfully opposed them with the very authorities to which they themselves laid claim. The whole subject turned on the nature of the Church—on its polity, and the ordination of the clergy—whether there actually existed an apostolical descent, and whence it was transmitted. To deny the validity of the orders of the Romish Church, is unquestionably absurd: for, however corrupt and degenerate that Church is, it cannot in the least degree affect the ordination it confers. For if such were the case, there would then be a dangerous position assumed, that there is a virtue in the ordination, which does not exist, any farther, than that no man without that ordination can lawfully and scripturally exercise the functions of the sacred office: and that he who does so, without being lawfully ordained to them, is actuated by that sectarian fanaticism which deluded multitudes in the seventeenth century, and produced an anarchy in the Church unparalleled in the records of history. If there be no such thing as regular and valid ordination, then there is no ministry, and it matters not how the sacraments are administered, or by

whom, seeing that one man has just as good a right to administer them as another. And if the orders of the Romish Church are to be rejected, as being part of the "mark of the beast," let the most zealous Dissenter tell us of what he has to boast, or what hidden virtue there is in his form of ordination. For the new inventions of modern times do not form the scriptural basis by which we are to regulate our ideas of ecclesiastical practice; and I hazard the assertion, even though it may be received with a sneer, that there is no Dissenting minister whose ordination is as valid or as scriptural as that of the Romish priests. And if tenaciousness of ordination be held as a remnant of popery, then why do Dissenters ordain at all, seeing that they submit to a practice, which, even though exercised in their own way, they cordially set at nought and despise? The truth is, every gift is not a grace: ordination is one thing, the doctrine taught is another: and he who imagines that the chief excellence of the Christian ministry rests in the mere act of preaching, and a human display of eloquence from the pulpit, labours under a most grievous delusion. The sacraments are among the ordinary means of salvation; and the efficacy of these sacraments is rendered void as well by the want of regular ordination, as by the unworthiness of the person partaking of them. Our Saviour himself, when he declared that his kingdom was not of this world, distinctly taught that the office of the priesthood was to be separate, distinct, and

removed from the secular concerns of the world; and that they who assume this office must be regularly admitted thereto according to the practice which he has enjoined, as laid down by the holy apostles.

Without, however, enlarging farther on this subject, I merely observe, that whatever may be thought of Laud's principles by Dissenters in the present day, to all conscientious members of the Episcopal Church they must appear sound and scriptural, otherwise their ministry or ordination is of little avail. If Laud was wrong, so was the Church, but he chose rather to err with the Church whose doctrines had been pondered well by the venerable fathers of the Reformation, than to adopt the private interpretation of any man, or be led away by the current of extravagance, which was daily making rapid encroachments. Not that he did not exercise that freedom of thought which is natural to every man: but he had studied the Scriptures with peculiar care, and the Articles appeared to him agreeable to that sacred standard.

But at this time an event happened, which materially altered the state of the kingdom. On the 24th of March, 1602-3, Queen Elizabeth died at Richmond, in the 70th year of her age, and 45th of her prosperous reign. Her administration had been brilliant and glorious; she had raised the kingdom to a degree of greatness, which made her an object of fear to foreign potentates, and gained her the admiration and affection of her subjects;

she knew well how to govern her people, and her promptitude and decision were equally remarkable in all her actions. It was her happiness to have statesmen whose names are rendered immortal, who loved their country, and who combined the most consummate political foresight with admirable talents for the administration of public affairs. She was invariably the defender of the Protestant Church, and though it may be questioned whether she ever felt the animating and superior power of true religion, yet her name will be transmitted to posterity with unsullied reputation for the fostering care which she bestowed on the Reformation. Not that her conduct is free from reproach. Her haughtiness and cruelty to the unhappy Mary, Queen of Scots, will always be a stigma on her memory, as acts of injustice, and outrages on injured innocence, unworthy of her vigorous mind, and which have few parallels in history. Her conduct to the clergy was often haughty and tyrannical. "She restored the Reformation it is true," says Collier, "but in many places left little provision to maintain it. She drew back the patrimony of the Church restored by her sister Queen Mary, and reached somewhat unkindly unto the remainder.—These things considered, if the Queen's usage of the clergy be compared with that which they experienced in the reign of Henry VIII. it is to be feared that it may be said, her little finger was thicker than her father's loins; and that he

disciplined them with whips, but she chastised them with scorpions[1]."

Thus far have I detailed the first years of the life of Laud. A new scene now opens to our view—the accession of James of Scotland—and the important public transactions in which Laud was engaged—the theological disputes of the times—and the encroachments of the Puritans, who were making rapid progress in their endeavours to overturn the constitution.

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 669, 670.

CHAPTER II.

1603-4.

Accession of James I.—State of parties at that period—Religious feeling—Conduct of James—Remarks on his life—The Presbyterians—Insolence of their ministers—The Scottish Episcopal Church—Review of the Puritan objections to Episcopacy—The Hampton Court Conference—Its objects and results—Remarks on the Articles—Concluding observations.

The eyes of the English nation were now turned on James; the princes of Europe beheld his accession to the English throne with no ordinary interest. More fortunate than any of his ancestors who had swayed the Scottish sceptre, and destined to be happier than any of his descendants, his singular good fortune was the source of envy to many continental princes, who beheld him called from the government of a small and feeble state, to become the monarch of three consolidated powerful kingdoms. Nor was the enthusiasm of the English nation on his accession the less excited,—though afterwards that very people, whose joy was so universal, were destined to exhibit many vicissitudes before the close of the seventeenth century. The beginning of that era saw the royal House of Stuart welcomed to the throne of Britain by every indi-

vidual: its close beheld those princes driven from the throne, exiled, and their station among the princes of Europe occupied by others.

I design to examine briefly the causes of this wonderful revolution in public opinion; in the mean time, it is necessary to offer a few general remarks upon the state of parties at this eventful period of our history. I have already noted the progress of Puritanism, more especially in the University of Oxford, during Laud's residence there, and the influence which the Puritan leaders possessed over the minds of the students. It must be confessed that they were great men, although led away by an extravagant zeal: but hitherto, although both Oxford and Cambridge were well supplied by those ecclesiastical malcontents, by the vigorous administration of Elizabeth, and the salutary restraints imposed by the primates, this faction had not in its early progress assumed a regular form, nor had it become united as one grand opposing body. The leaders and partizans were detached, and even in dispute among themselves: at all events, many of them, though raising a clamour about a second reformation, as they called it, were by no means anxious to leave the Church. But on James' accession, they had become more united: and they clearly saw the necessity of co-operation. The genius of Laud had excited their alarm, and his sentiments in the lectures he delivered were not to be passed over in silence. He was, in fact, no common opponent: he was not to be put down by the sophisms of

Calvin, or the tenets of Genevan theology: and, armed as he was with an intimate knowledge of every argument of the Papists on the one hand, and of the Puritans on the other, they already anticipated this man in his rise to power, which they foresaw was inevitable. They could indeed boast of great men among their own adherents, whose learning was profound, and not surpassed by Laud himself, but unfortunately, however, having deeply imbibed the opinions of Calvin, they rejected the practice of the apostles and the authority of the primitive Church, in their anxiety to comprehend and expound the Institutes of that Reformer. But here was a man who was under no such restraints: who valued no more the opinion of Calvin than he did that of the Bishop of Rome, and who was resolved to uphold and defend that Church whose ordination he had received, according to her Articles, and to the canons passed in her most solemn Convocations[1].

[1] The famous Thomas Cartwright died the year before James' accession. Whitgift had all along treated him with lenity, thinking that when his enthusiasm subsided, he would become well affected towards the Church, and was not disappointed in the expectations he had formed of him. Cartwright, who had contributed his full share towards the spread of Calvinism, and the fomenting of the religious disputes, after being admitted to bail, through the kindness of the Archbishop, died expressing his good inclinations towards the Established Church. He always acknowledged with gratitude the primate's kindness, as appears from several of his letters to the primate.—Sir George Paul's Life of Whitgift, p. 71, 72. Strype's Annals, chap. xxviii.

The accession of James was hailed by men of all ranks, and in that perilous age, when religious disputes engaged the attention of almost every man, each party beheld it with jealous and interested feelings. Surrounded by the stern reformers of the north, who, by the excitement of their frenzy had marched over the country, carrying with them fire, sword, and sedition, and committing the most ruthless and furious devastations[1]: educated by the celebrated George Buchanan, a philosopher in principle, and a zealous votary of Geneva in religion[2], who defended the excesses of his reforming friends, and traduced the memory of the hapless Mary, his first benefactress; it was supposed by the Calvinists of the north, and their brethren the Puritans of the south, that they would have now a king after their own heart, more especially as the former had compelled James, during his minority, to sign all

Sir Henry Yelverton, in his Epistle to the Reader before Morton's Episcopacy Justified. "His last words on his death-bed were, that he sorely lamented the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church, by the schism he had been the great fomenter of, and wished he was to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world the dislike he had of his former ways."

[1] Knox's History, p. 136, 147, &c. Spottiswoode's Hist. p. 121—126. Stuart's Hist. of Scottish Reformation, p. 113, 114. 203, 204. Dalyell's Cursory Remarks on Scottish Poems of the Sixteenth Century, vol. i. in the account of the Earl of Moray, p. 52, 53.

[2] Nevertheless, Buchanan says of himself, that he was a Lutheran. *Vita scrip. ipso.*—Dr. Irving's Memoirs.

their covenants, confessions, and leagues, of every description. Accordingly, although James, when he assumed the reins of government, had given indications that he was not so pliable as they imagined, and, moreover, being more learned than the Presbyterian ministers, was easily able to confound them in their positions, yet the Puritans, and those who favoured their doctrines, presuming on his Presbyterian education, or, at least, upon his favour and connivance, began to raise their desponding minds, and to augur much from this new combination of circumstances[1]. The Roman Catholics, who looked on the enthusiasm of the Puritans with perfect contempt, and who, in truth, were animated with less hatred towards them than towards the Established Church, (although the Puritans clamoured the more violently against them,) beheld James' accession with the greatest exultation, and naturally expected favour from a monarch whose mother they considered to have died a martyr for their cause. The supporters of the Reformed Church by law established, were not the less animated by hope; for, the Church being an integral part of the constitution, the king was bound to defend it against Popery and Puritanism, the two extremes between which the Church of England was placed.

Nevertheless, Archbishop Whitgift was not without fears concering James's real intentions. That excellent primate had been entrusted by Elizabeth with

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 3, 4.

the government of the Church, he had been long and deservedly in the favour of the queen, he had attended her in her last illness, and had composed a prayer on that occasion, remarkable for its piety and beauty[1]. He had been the chief mourner at her funeral, had received the offerings, and had the banners presented to him, as if he had been a member of the royal House. It is observed by Sir George Paul, that he had the chief management of all ecclesiastical affairs, the disposal of the bishoprics, and other patronage; and that the queen laid the whole burden of those cares upon his shoulders, saying, That if any thing were amiss, it was upon his soul and conscience to answer for it; for she had rid her hands, and looked that he would yield an account on her behalf unto Almighty God[2]. After James had been proclaimed, the Archbishop dis-

[1] Sir George Paul's Life of Whitgift, p. 116. Strype, chap. xxix. from Reg. Whitgift, vol. iii. p. 148. The words of this beautiful prayer are:—O most heavenly Father, and God of all mercy, we most humbly beseech thee to behold thy servant the queen, with the eyes of pity and compassion. Give unto her the comfort of thy Holy Spirit, work in her a constant and lively faith, grant unto her true repentance, and restore unto her, if it be thy will, her former health and strength both of body and soul. Let not the enemy, nor his wicked instruments, have any power ever to do her harm. O Lord, punish her not for our offences, neither us in her. Deal not with us, O Lord, as we have deserved; but for thy mercy's sake, and for Christ's sake, forgive us all our sins, and prolong her days, that we may still enjoy her, to the glory of thy holy name, and good of all such as truly fear thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

[2] Sir G. Paul's Life of Archbishop Whitgift, p. 78.

patched Dr. Neville, Dean of Canterbury, into Scotland to do homage in the name of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, and to ascertain the king's intentions concerning the government of the Church. Though James declared that he would maintain the Church as then established, yet Whitgift passed the summer of the year 1604 in great anxiety [1]. The king's arrival, however, dissipated those fears, and at once opened the eyes of the nonconformists. They had printed a book in the former year, entitled "The Plea of the Innocents," which was written by one Nicholls, and now they had begun to despise the church service, "to forbear the use of the surplice, and to omit the ceremonies; and those omissions they hoped would be acceptable to the king, considering his education, and the practice of the Scotch kirk [2]." But a proclamation ap-

[1] Neal, the Puritan historian, who takes every opportunity to prevaricate, here remarks, that the king's assurances "comforted the timorous Archbishop, who had sometimes spoken with great uneasiness about the Scotch Church." The latter clause is true, but it became this historian to be a candid man; for though Dr. Neville did get such an assurance from James, it was *a general one*, and Whitgift was *not comforted* by it. Neal himself records, that James in his public declaration at Edinburgh in 1590, said, "As for our neighbour Kirk of England their service is an evil said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings." James, by the way, was under *tutorage* when he uttered this speech. There was occasion for being timorous, when surrounded by men who were undermining the Church.

[2] Collier, vol. ii. p. 671, 672.

peared on the king's arrival, strictly prohibiting any innovation in the doctrine or discipline of the Church as established by law.

It was not to be expected that James would escape censure for this procedure. Besides the imputation that he had changed his principles, *(if he had any,* says Neal,) the most pusillanimous insinuations were daily sent abroad by the Puritans. Forgetting that James had been the offspring of misfortune—that both his parents had suffered violent deaths—they actually asserted that he was deficient in intellect, and that the surprise which his mother had experienced at the murder of Rizzio had so affected the fœtus, as to produce this intellectual weakness. But James, though peacefully inclined, was neither a coward nor an imbecile man. He had grappled with an assassin in the Gowry conspiracy; in after life he gave other proofs of courage; and his learning, though it abounded with pedantry, was extensive and profound. But what insinuations will not disappointment and passion provoke? Men blinded by religious enthusiasm forget the first principles of true religion, and resort to miserable subterfuges, which excite contempt and derision[1].

[1] The circumstances in which James was placed when he assumed the government were of a peculiar kind. He was never a real Presbyterian, though he has been often charged with apostasy by that party. His age had witnessed the most dreadful catastrophes, and there is not perhaps in the history of any nation events so pregnant with interest as those which took place

But it seems not the less surprising, that James should still be viewed by Presbyterians as if he had at one period of his life belonged completely to their party, and as if he had made a fearful apostasy when he succeeded to the English throne. Now, the simple truth is, that Andrew Melville first introduced Calvinism into Scotland; for, though Knox and the other Reformers were disciples of Calvin, they by no means adopted the system of ecclesiastical parity, but established the form of government by superintendents, (another term for *bishops*,) of whom there were *five;* and this polity was not, as some late Presbyterian writers would persuade us, designed to be merely temporary, but to be the regular ecclesiastical constitution of the Church[1]. Knox had himself, though at one period

in Scotland in the sixteenth century. Scarcely one of the leading men escaped a violent death. James's great-grandfather, James IV, was slain at Flodden, with the flower of the nobility; his grandfather, James V, died of a broken heart; his father murdered by an unprincipled nobleman; his mother, the hapless Mary, murdered, too, under colour of justice, by the English queen. Cardinal Beaton assassinated by a band of enthusiasts in his own palace; his successor, Archbishop Hamilton, most unjustly executed; Huntly slain; Moray assassinated; Maitland of Lethington committed suicide; Bothwell degraded and despised, a vile pirate in the Northern Seas; Morton brought to the block; Kirkcaldy of Grange hanged as a traitor; terminating with the famous Gowry conspiracy. In short, every man who figured in public was cut off, with only one or two exceptions, without taking into account those who suffered for religion.

[1] It were easy to multiply references and authorities in proof of my positions, but it is needless, and indeed the very anxiety

of his life he refused a bishopric[1], been the bearer

of the Presbyterians to make the superintendent system, which, they well know, was nothing else than a form of Episcopacy, as if it were designed merely *pro tempore*, is a sufficient argument in favour. The Scottish reformers might have had a horror at the name of *bishop*, if they had not the sagacity to disunite that office from the associations of Popery, and therefore they changed the word, which, by the way, has exactly the same meaning; but no man who is acquainted with Knox's temper and actions, in particular, will for one moment suppose, that he was likely to gratify the prejudices or the associations of any individual. No; he was for immediate reformation; he forgot that all improvements must he accomplished by the slow and imperceptible hand of time. "But after all," says Collier, whose authority is just as good as that of Dr. M'Crie, as set forth in the Life of Knox, vol. ii. and in the Life of Andrew Melville, vol. i. "Knox was no entire convert to the Geneva discipline; he declared against Presbyterian parity, promoted the superintendent scheme, and pressed submission to that establishment." Eccles. Hist. vol. ii.

[1] It may be disputed, however, whether Edward VI. did actually offer Knox a bishopric; his admirers affirm so, but he himself only hints, in his "Historie," about some great preferment, which he rejected. His ambition would not have been gratified by his remaining in England, for he wished not to be a member, but the leader of a party. In some editions of his Historie, there is the above insinuation, but it must be recollected, that there are considerable doubts as to the authenticity of the work, because Knox was dead before its publication, and we find the General Assembly of the Kirk granting authority to Richard Bannatyne, Knox's servant, a violent enthusiast, to collect and collate all the scraps and papers which Knox had left after his decease. His Genevan friends, therefore, thrust in what they pleased to favour their own purposes, and to make Knox speak the language of their party. Goodall's Queen Mary, vol. i.

of a letter to the Bishops of the Church of England, in which he and his friends distinctly acknowledged Episcopacy, and their own polity as a modification of it [1]. Melville, however, a furious zealot, was the first in Scotland who ventured to call in question the episcopal office, which he did in a crafty manner, by practising on one John Durie, a minister in Edinburgh, a good but simple and unlearned man, whom, in a General Assembly, he persuaded to start the question, which he, of course, vigorously seconded. It is somewhat remarkable, too, that Melville, zealot as he was, admits in his speech on this very occasion, that the episcopal office is laid down in holy Scripture; expressing himself in the following contradictory manner: "It is true the distinction of bishops is mentioned in Scripture, but then it was not to be taken in the customary construction, for our Saviour has allowed no superiority among his ministers: he himself is

[1] Knox's History, p. 439. Spottiswoode's History, p. 198. Bishop Keith's History, folio. M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. ii. Dr. Cook's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. Appendix. This is a remarkable fact, even though the letter was written in favour of the Puritans. It was signed by the five superintendents, to-wit, John Spottiswoode, father of the Archbishop; John Winram, who had been subprior of St. Andrew's; John Erskine, the baron of Dun; John Row, and Robert Pont; with the names of a few ministers attached. It is entitled, "The superintendents, ministers, and others, of the realm of Scotland, to their brethren, the bishops and pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman Antichrist, and do profess with them the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

the only Lord of his Church, and as for his officers, they are all ranged in the same degree, and allotted the same proportion of power." It is needless to comment on this absurd observation.

It must be observed, that no act of parliament was ever passed for the abolition of Scottish Episcopacy; and, in fact, no acts at all, save those of the Assembly, which, after 1575, was very often self-elected. Hence, the Episcopal Church, until the period of the Revolution in 1688, was the Church established by law, as it had been often ratified by various parliaments. The Regent Morton had established Episcopacy, in the person of John Douglas, whom he presented to the primacy of St. Andrew's, and who was accordingly consecrated to that office. The very first year, then, in which James governed in his own person, he evinced his dislike to the Genevan polity, and it was not allowed to pass unnoticed. But that monarch, though he never regarded Melville and his associates with friendly feelings, was often tutored unto submission by those whom he favoured among the nobles, and hence arose his speeches on various occasions, which the Puritans afterwards turned so much against him.

It is amusing to observe the opinions which the Puritan historian indulges on James's accession. That *veracious* writer, determined to support his enthusiastic party at the expence of truth, fears not to hazard any assertion, however absurd or contradictory; and as Laud is most conspicuous in his narrative of this period, for the public share he

sustained in the controversies of the day, a few remarks upon the following passages may not be out of place. "There had been a cessation of controversy," says Neal[1], "for some time before the death of Queen Elizabeth: the Puritans being in hopes, upon the accession of a king that had been educated in their own principles, to obtain an easy redress of their grievances; and certainly no prince ever had it so much in his power to compromise the differences of the Church as King James I. at the Conference at Hampton Court; *but being an indolent and vain glorious monarch,* he became a willing captive to the bishops, who flattered his vanity, and put that maxim into his head, '*No bishop, no king.*'"—"If King James," he farther remarks, "had any principles of religion besides what he called king-craft, or dissimulation, he changed them with the climate, for, from being a rigid Calvinist, he became a favourer of Arminianism in the latter part of his reign: from being a Protestant of the purest kirk upon earth[2], a doctrinal papist[3]: and, from a disguised Puritan, the most implacable enemy of that

[1] Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. Preface, p. iii. iv.

[2] He here means the Kirk of Scotland. Cedite Graii! It is an assertion which even some of the members of that legal establishment would not hazard at the present day, though it is much better now than it was in the days of Andrew Melville, or the succeeding years of covenanting chivalry.

[3] That Neal must have been aware he was here writing a falsehood, is undeniable, if he had any common discrimination. Luckily for him, he does not give his authorities; in truth, he could not, but his followers have believed it!

people, putting all the springs of the prerogative in motion to drive them out of both kingdoms." And once more, to the same purpose, in another place, about James's accession, "The Scotch ministers did not approach him with the distant submission and reverence of the English bishops, and therefore within nine months he renounced Presbytery, and established it for a maxim, no bishop, no king: so soon did this pious monarch renounce all his former principles, (if he had any,) and break the most awful and solemn oaths and vows [1]."

The above assertions are utterly groundless from beginning to end, and this, even although I were not persuaded that future generations will yet do justice to the too-often misrepresented motives and actions of James, when those times arrive in which men will divest themselves of the prejudice of party, and accustom themselves to calm and sober reflection. These statements, however, are false, on three accounts: *first*, because they contain a dogmatic apology for the fanaticism of the Puritans, not on facts, but on mere assumptions; *secondly*, because they are libels on the character of James, which are disgraceful to the writer, in his lamentation for James's departure from "the purest kirk on earth;" because they are not supported; and because some few phrases which the monarch used in ordinary conversation, are taken advantage of:

[1] Neal's History, vol. ii. p. 4. Calderwood's Church History, p. 418. 473, &c.

thirdly, because they are denied by historical fact, and refuted by the practice of modern times.

The apology which is here made for the fanaticism of the Puritans is remarkable. There had been no cessation of controversy before the death of Elizabeth, for the Puritans, as I have already shewn, had filled the Universities with their disputes, had been patronized by Walsingham, and had been strengthening themselves by training future supporters to their cause. If there was a cessation, it was because they had the advantage, and, being adepts in intrigue, they looked forward to the accession of James as the period of their complete triumph: for already did they prevail in the University of Oxford under the fostering care of Abbot, and Cambridge contained a considerable number of the disciples of Cartwright. Accordingly we find, that in the former University they held the chief influence, until Laud astonished them by his lecture of Mrs. Maye's foundation. The Puritan leaders had been industrious in circulating their principles among the people, as their works still testify, and they were indefatigable in securing to themselves a vantage-ground, which they anticipated would enable them to triumph in the next reign. Knowing Elizabeth's determined opposition to them, it was not to be supposed that they would brave her power: her decease could not be far distant; they were busy, therefore, in laying the foundation on which they were afterwards to build. But not a single authority can be adduced to prove

that this part of Neale's representation is supported by facts, and the slightest examination might have satisfied that writer, had he resolved to be candid, that the very history of those enthusiasts whom he lauds so highly, is against himself; nay, he himself has written in his first volume what he directly contradicts in the second.

These statements, again, are false, because they are malicious libels on the character of James. We are told, that "from a Protestant of the purest kirk upon earth," he became "a doctrinal Papist [1]," from a "disguised Puritan," he became their "implacable enemy." And were there, then, no purer churches in that age than the Kirk of Scotland? and are the opinions of John Calvin the sole criterion of purity? But do the admirers of Neal require to be told that it is not so? I am persuaded that there are few Dissenters in England, the very descend-

[1] By the phrase, a "doctrinal papist," it must be understood, I presume, that James was a believer in the doctrines of the Romish Church; otherwise, if the Puritan historian really did write figuratively, he might have condescended to explain his meaning more fully. But the severity of James' treatment towards the Roman Catholics so exasperated them, that human sagacity alone enabled him to escape from the dreadful vengeance which they had prepared to execute on him and his court, in the memorable Gunpowder Plot. From his fondness for controversial learning, too, he founded Chelsea College, for the support of a number of polemical divines, whose talents and exertions were to be employed in refuting the Roman Catholics. This is the monarch whom our Puritan calls a "doctrinal papist," and a prince who "was destitute of principle, if he ever had any!"

ants of the Puritans, who will subscribe to these assertions of their historiographer. The preachers of the "purest kirk upon earth" had disgusted James on almost every occasion. They had insulted him, traduced the memory of his mother, had openly denounced her before his face, had made pointed allusions to her from the pulpit, had offered seditious prayers to the throne of Heaven, had preached sedition. Whenever their conclave thought proper to legislate, they did so as if that legislation were the standard of government; if the slightest opposition was made, condemnation was openly denounced: they were invariably sharers in secret plots and intrigues; continually interfering in politics, with which they had no concern; they vindicated the plots of more than one band of conspirators; they had their own share in the daring conspiracy of Ruthven, Earl of Gowrie: in a word, they declared that they were superior to the parliament, and that it had no right to enact laws without their consent, "because," said they, "our power is of God, and Jesus Christ alone is our king." Such were the insufferable conduct and fanaticism of the preachers of the "the purest kirk upon earth." And if the Church of Scotland was the purest then, it must consequently be the purest *now*, for it professes (at least its present members do for themselves,) that it is a perfect specimen of the early Scottish Reformation. But there is not a Dissenter in England, not even Presbyterians, who would not smile at this assertion: and more than once have

they declared their opinions on this matter[1], and they, by a singular inconsistency with the practice of their ancestors, reject the Erastian tenet, "That Christ and his apostles have prescribed no particular form of discipline for the Church in after ages, but have left the keys in the hands of the civil magistrate, who has the sole power of punishing transgressors, and of appointing such particular forms of church-government from time to time, as are most subservient to the peace and welfare of the commonwealth." This was the notable discovery of John Calvin, too, after what Dr. Cook calls, "a careful study of the New Testament:" and the very essence of Calvinism therefore is, the doctrine of resistance to civil governors, if, no matter how trivial or useful, they should be conceived to do any thing which the individual chooses to think a grievance[2]. A strange inconsistency truly, first to give the civil magistrate the sword, and then to aver that it is lawful to resist his authority, if it be thought that he rules with impropriety. Who are the judges? The people, say the admirers of Calvin; but is it not a fact, that a state in which every man sets himself as an expounder of the laws would be one of anarchy and bloodshed:—that the people are not themselves sufficient judges, nor, if they promise obedience, have they a right to dispute

[1] See the Congregational Magazine, for 1819, No. 16; and the Evangelical Magazine for April 1828, in the review of the *Scotch Presbytery* of London's *Pastoral Letter*.

[2] Calvin's Epist. 283. 285. 305, 306. Knox's Hist. 391—401.

authority, however repugnant that may be to their individual opinions? These remarks are not against liberty of conscience, but they are against private interpretation; and history presents a too faithful record of the effects of those baneful maxims which were inculcated in this country. For, from the combined violence and fanaticism of the English Puritans and the Scottish Covenanters, we know enough to deprecate another attempt to make the rabble of a nation the judges and arbiters of religious and political disputes.

I venture to add one remark upon the Puritan historian's assertion, that James was a "doctrinal Papist," and that from "a disguised Puritan," he became their most "implacable enemy." These falsehoods are made, because James defended his own prerogative, and the Episcopal Church of England, and because he did not countenance and yield to puritanical extravagance[1]. But James, though pedantic, and often imprudent—though at times weak, and, it may be, indolent, was not deficient in political foresight, though he knew not always how to exercise it. His misfortune, and that of his successor, was the want of such able statesmen as conducted the public affairs in the reign of Elizabeth, while his partiality to favourites made him elevate some to that distinction who had no capacity for it, and disregard others who were more deserving. But he saw the enthusiasm of his Pu-

[1] Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland, edited from the original MS. by C. Kirkpatrick Sharpe, Esq. 4to. Edit. 1817, p. 15, 16.

ritan subjects; he needed "no bishops" to be his instructors; he had felt it, severely felt it, before his accession, while his rule was confined to their Presbyterian friends in the north. He saw it necessary, therefore, to assert his prerogative, to draw tightly the reins of government, and, if possible, to restrain that religious frenzy which had excited the spirit of faction. The pupil of Buchanan was not destitute of penetration, and he is called a "doctrinal papist," not because he believed in Popery, for not even the sturdiest Puritan could be animated by a greater anti-popish zeal than he, but because he became the "implacable enemy" of men who, he saw, were secretly spreading their enthusiastic opinions throughout the kingdom, to overthrow the constitution of the Church and State, and who were attempting to make Calvin the grand oracle of all theological and political science. What, therefore, was the result? Of what advantage would the reformation of religion have been to James, as a monarch and a prince, had he yielded at his accession to the demands of the Puritans? A Church in which "every man did that which was right in his own eyes," and rejected all human authority, was a nursery of sedition, of treason, of every thing, in short, which could molest and annoy, and which its preachers would not fail to defend, in their visionary themes about spirituality, and what they termed *things lawful.* These remarks, therefore, are against *private interpretation,* whether in religion or politics: it should be the voice of the learned, not of the ignorant; of the prudent, not of

the clamorous and violent: and not even should it be always the former, seeing that they are alike subject to deception. The Reformation had indeed rid James of the intolerance and tyranny of one Pope; but to have yielded to Puritans, would have been to have raised up against himself a pope in every parish of England and Scotland. He had been delivered, I say, from the absurdities of one extreme, now he would have fallen into another. And if the contest had been between him and the Bishop of Rome, if he fell, there was glory in the fall: it was to crouch before the majestic lion: but to have fallen before the Puritans, and the Calvinistic preachers of the north, to have yielded to them, to have allowed their fanaticism to triumph,—it was unworthy of him as an English monarch.

The Puritan historian's assertions are, moreover, proved to be false by historical facts, and are refuted by the practice of modern times. The former part of this particular I shall point out as I proceed; the latter part may be discussed in a few words. "No bishop, no king," was a favourite phrase among their party, which they faithfully repeated from James, who had jocularly used it on one occasion. But granting its absurdity, had it been seriously used, the practice of the Puritans, and indeed their language, may justly be retorted upon them with no less acrimony, for it was with them virtually, No Puritans, no freedom; no Calvinism, no religion; no Presbytery, no true church-government; no opposition to Episcopacy, no li-

berty of conscience! And, let it be noted, the writer who has faithfully recorded this phrase, and his partizans who believe it true, are the very persons whose conduct displays that heated imagination which will not allow men to think with candour, and reason with impartiality. It has, indeed, been again and again asserted by the Presbyterians of the north, and the Dissenters of the south, and in this they make a most deplorable display of ignorance, that Episcopacy did not exist before it was countenanced by the civil power: that it was readily adopted by those monarchs who aimed at arbitrary government and despotism: and that it is merely a worldly hierarchy, existing solely by the support and protection of the secular arm: therefore, according to these speculators, there can be no Episcopacy where there is no monarchy—no Episcopacy where there is no civil support. The first and second of these assertions will come under my notice in another place: let me therefore make a single remark on the third, and on the natural inference which is to be drawn from the facts. In the United States of America, in which it yet remains to be shewn whether the government, or that of the monarchy of England, is the wiser and the better, notwithstanding the high encomiums which have been passed on that republicanism by certain men in this country,—under a government which professes to countenance no religion at all, but to protect every sect, however absurd and ridiculous its belief, however infidel and deluding,—in that coun-

try, where, notwithstanding its many works of religious philanthropy, infidelity stalks abroad, shewing its gorgon head, and ejecting its deadly poison, there is a branch of the Episcopal Church, having dioceses and regularly consecrated bishops, who by their practice conform to every apostolical and primitive injunction—which Church, to say the least, ranks the third in point of numbers in the United States, and the first in point of the learning and moral worth of its clergy, and its conformity to apostolical truth and primitive order. Here, then, is a church, a branch of the ancient Episcopal Church, which has bishops, where there is "no king;" and which is not only existing, but reckons an increase of its members every year. This fact, therefore, proves the fallaciousness and ignorance of the assertion, that Episcopacy is dependent upon monarchy, and cannot prosper without it; which is refuted by Presbyterianism being now the *legal* establishment of Scotland, which, though professing to be republican and free in its constitution, nevertheless is closely allied to the state, and exists as an establishment by its protection from the secular power.

But there is another proof, which in a discussion of this nature, and especially in a narrative of Laud's life and times, ought not to be forgotten. I allude to that venerable and primitive, though humble and depressed communion, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, about which it will be my duty hereafter to say much in detail. This small suffering Church, in whose welfare Laud in his prosperous

days interested himself so greatly, has existed since the Revolution in a state of total neglect, at which period it ceased to be the Established Church, not because William III. had any particular partiality for Presbyterianism, although a Calvinist, for he solemnly declared to Bishop Rose of Edinburgh, at the Hague, that he would preserve it, but because the bishops and clergy, from conscientious motives, would not take the oath of allegiance. Nay, this Church has not only existed without the slightest support or patronage from the secular power, but even when its clergy were proscribed and punished, if found "worshipping God after the manner of their fathers," when its members were prohibited from assembling themselves together, and when their chapels were plundered and destroyed by outrageous and ignorant mobs of Presbyterians. Nor was this the procedure of that age of strife, turbulence, and sedition, when the zealots of the Covenant drew the sword, and threw the scabbard away, but it was the procedure of the eighteenth century, and the vengeance of the government was wreaked on the unfortunate Episcopalians of Scotland, as if they had been the chief ringleaders of the insurrection of 1745. The Episcopal clergy had been *rabbled out* (as it was called) from their livings on the triumph of Presbytery in 1688, nor were the insults few which they experienced from the stern and intolerant Calvinists. But with a purpose still more malignant, more than half a century after that event, the Presbyterians made ample retaliation for the

persecutions which their fathers were said to have undergone, and which they most unjustly and ignorantly ascribed to the Church. At that time, they procured edicts from the court, not only against the Episcopalians of Scotland, but against their religion itself[1]; and some of the clergy were actually imprisoned in the middle of the last century for officiating according to the established ritual of the Church. Nor was it till within the last thirty years that those penal acts were removed, which so disgracefully oppressed this humble Church, under which it laboured long, without exciting the commiseration of the more flourishing Church of England. And at this moment, what are the prospects of this our Church in Scotland? We rejoice to know that it is advancing in popular opinion, which must be the case in proportion as men become more enlightened; that it can reckon a considerable number of chapels within the five dioceses, and that it can boast of a clergy who are not, for learning, in any respect, behind their more favoured neighbours of England. Here, then, is another branch of the Episcopal Church, existing, as if in a republic, without any protection from the state save toleration; and yet the episcopal order is preserved without the slightest variation. This is a powerful argument against the maxim on which the Puritans have expatiated so copiously, "no bishop, no king."

[1] The reader will find this subject copiously treated in the Continuation to Bishop Keith's Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops, by the Rev. Dr. Russel of Leith.

Having made these remarks, it is needless to enlarge farther on the religious state of the kingdom at the accession of James. The Puritans, who had indulged in the most sanguine hopes, and who had thought proper to make some innovations in the Church, were extremely mortified at the king's proclamation, that no alteration was to take place in the doctrine and discipline. They were not, however, all animated with the same spirit, nor inclined to proceed at the very outset to unwarrantable extremes; for though they were all inclined to Presbyterianism, and secretly designed the downfall of the Church, "they disliked," says Collier, "those sallies of zeal, and resolved to manage by a more regular motion." Accordingly, they appointed meetings among themselves; and, after a long deliberation, they presented a petition to the king, entitled, "The humble petition of certain Ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of sundry ceremonies and abuses." This petition, known as the famous Millenary Petition, because, it was alleged to have been subscribed by a thousand Puritan ministers, though it wanted, at the least two hundred to complete that number [1], was presented in the month of April, 1603. Its preamble was set forth by a denial that they "were factious men, affecting a popular party in the Church," or that they were "schismatics, aiming at the dis-

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 672. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 5.

solution of the state ecclesiastical;" but affirming that they were "faithful ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects to his Majesty;" and that they groaned "under the burden of human rites and ceremonies:" and they proceeded to enumerate their desires of reformation in four heads; namely, in the church service; concerning ministers; about church livings; and on church discipline. As this petition, though written in plausible language, and making no express remonstrance against Episcopacy, or the service of the Liturgy, bore generally against the whole practice of the Church, the Universities instantly opposed it, as they were more likely to discover the designs of the Puritans, from the numbers who resided within their walls. An order passed at a Congregation in Cambridge, ordaining that he who wrote against the Church, or opposed in any way the doctrine and discipline, should be suspended from all his degrees, and be deprived of taking others at any future period [1]. Instructions were also given to draw out an answer to the petition; but the heads of colleges at Cambridge, being informed that an answer was in a state of considerable forwardness at Oxford, contented themselves with merely writing a letter of thanks to that University for its zeal and activity.

Laud had by this time been chosen Proctor for

[1] Collier, ut sup. p. 673. Fuller's Church History, p. 22. Wood, Athen. Oxon. Life of Whitgift, p. 267. Neal, vol. ii. p. 7.

the University of Oxford, his appointment to that office being dated May 4, 1603[1]. Although he took no remarkable share in the answer to the Millenary Petition, he yet exerted all his influence to thwart the craftiness and smoothness which were concealed therein. He penetrated into its design, and as it had been strongly rumoured that some of the Scots Presbyterians at court had promised to aid it with all their influence, thereby furthering the views of their Calvinistic friends in the north, and as he saw, moreover, that its success would prove the destruction not only of the Church, but also of the Universities, he lent his efficient aid to the reply, entitled, "An Answer of the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, &c. in the University of Oxford, to the Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England desiring Reformation." In this petition, the University justly charges the Puritans with false conduct, in first *subscribing*, and then *complaining* of those things which they had subscribed. They are asserted to be factious men, and some severe but just remarks are made on the Scotch reformation, and the intemperate zeal for novelty which characterized those who were embroiling the Church in that kingdom. A severe censure, too, is passed therein on the intolerance of Presbyterianism, as it was displayed among the Scots, by which every preacher carried himself in the most domineering manner, not only towards his equals

[1] Diary, p. 2.

who differed from him, but even towards those who conducted the government.

Nothing, in truth, could be more unfair than the conduct of the Puritans on this occasion. Besides giving occasion to a multitude of smaller petitions from all quarters of the country, they had not the manliness to declare, that they wished the extirpation of Episcopacy, and the establishment of Presbyterianism, that irreverent offspring of a foreign soil, but they adopted covert language, and affected the greatest piety and moderation. The measures which they took to procure subscriptions, too, were characteristic of the party. The chief petition, indeed, was subscribed only by ministers, but the minor ones were subscribed by every person who could scrawl his own name. "Sure I am," says Fuller[1], "the prelatical party complained, that to swell a number, the non-conformists did not choose, but scrape subscribers, not to speak of the *ubiquitariness* of some hands, the same being always present at all petitions. Indeed, to the first only ministers were admitted, but to the latter brood of petitions, no hand which had five fingers was refused. Insomuch, that Master George (now Lord) Goring, who then knew little, and cared less, for Church government, as unable to govern himself, being then (fifty years since,) rather a youth than a man, a boy than a youth, set his hand thereto, in the right, I believe, of his mother, a good lady,

[1] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 24.

and much inclined to that party: and King James would in merriment make sport with him, to know, what reasons moved him at that age to this subscription."

The result of this petition was the famous Hampton Court Conference, held on the 14th of January, 1604. In this procedure the king acted contrary to the practice of his predecessor. Elizabeth conceived that public religious disputations frequently induced disorders, and therefore she avoided them altogether; but James was of a different opinion, and resolved to embrace the opportunity of having a public debate, and perhaps making a display of his learning, of which he was exceedingly vain. He accordingly issued a summons to each party for this Conference. The commissioners of the Church were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Worcester, St. David's, Chichester, Peterborough, and Carlisle, the Deans of Westminster, St. Paul's, Christ Church, Worcester, Salisbury, Chester, and Windsor, with Dr. King, the Archdeacon of Nottingham, and Dr. Field, afterwards Dean of Gloucester. The Millenary petitioners, on their side, sent only four delegates—Dr. John Reynolds, already mentioned, and Dr. Thomas Sparke, from Oxford; Messrs. Chadderton and Knewstubbe, from Cambridge[1]. The Conference lasted three days, and ultimately

[1] The Sum and Substance of the Hampton Court Conference, by William Barlow, D.D. and Dean of Chester, London, 1604.

ended in the defeat of the Nonconformists. It produced, however, some alterations in the Liturgy. The baptizing of children by women was forbidden: in the rubric of absolution, the words, *the remission of sins,* were inserted: confirmation was termed *an examination of children:* some words were altered in the Gospels; and it was resolved at this Conference, in fine, that there should be a new translation of the Bible [1]. This most important of all points, was speedily carried into effect, and our present translation is the version which was produced by the famous Conference at Hampton Court [2].

[1] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 21.

[2] The changes, to be more particular, were as follows. In the general absolution, after the confession of sin, the words *the remission of sins,* were added. In the office for baptism, instead of *let them that be present,* we now have, "let the lawful minister and them that be present." See some other minor changes, on comparing the Book of Common Prayer, printed in 1599, with that of 1615. Dr. Reynolds and his three friends were satisfied with these changes and explanations, and promised to render due obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors. *The thanksgivings,* added on this occasion, were those for rain, fair weather, plenty, peace, and victory, and for deliverance from the plague, with a few additions to the Catechism. Vide Records, apud Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. No. C. from the Paper Office. I extract the last particular, under "the fourth head to be reformed rather by care of good magistrates, than by straitness of law." "Lastly, for matter of ceremonies and order, being thought indifferent, that the rule of the apostle be kept, that all things be done to edification, that so neither grave, sober, and peaceable persons be not too far urged at first, nor turbulent and unquiet

Neal, the Puritan historian, speaks of this Conference with great contempt. He calls it "a mock conference," and insinuates that the commissioners of the Church had transacted matters with the king before the appointed time. Reynolds, it would appear, lost the favour of his party; and though Neal well knew that he was defeated in the argument, he accounts for it by asserting, that it was nothing wonderful, "being overawed by the place and company, and his sovereign as his opponent." The Puritans, indeed, sent forth numerous misrepresentations of this Conference, being enraged at the keen disappointment. They asserted, that the King had summoned their delegates, not to hear them debate, but to inform them of his pleasure; not to know what they wished to say, but to let them know what he resolved to do. They charged Dr. Barlow with giving a partial account of the disputation, alleging, that as he was then a professed enemy, it must follow that his account was false. But the conduct of the King during the conference deserves the highest applause; and from the remarks on Dr. Barlow's narrative, it is evident that the Puritans were not an order of men at all inclined to learn truth even from an enemy. Though Neal asserts, that the primate and his brethren had been indefatigable in possessing the King with their opi-

persons, and true spirits, to do what they list. These," it is added, "are the conclusions of this conference, wherein his Majesty sat as moderator to the great admiration of all."

nions of the excellency of the English hierarchy, as resembling the practice of the primitive Church, and best suited to monarchical government, thereby insinuating, according to custom, that his friends received unfair treatment; yet the observations which James made are honourable to his talents, and creditable to his learning. It was no hasty tutorage which induced that prince to decide; indeed, it was by no means easy to control him in points which related to theological speculations. But the Puritans did not stop with these insinuations; numerous pamphlets were printed and circulated among their associates, in which they abused Dr. Barlow, who had published an account of the conference. "Notwithstanding," says Collier, "the Nonconformists came off with disadvantage, they gave out the news of their having gained an absolute victory: and for this purpose they affirmed, that the King had gratified Dr. Reynolds in every thing desired; that these concessions (the alterations in the Liturgy) were but the beginnings of reformation; and that greater things were expected; that the Bishop of Winchester was silent upon the matter; that the Bishop of London called Dr. Reynolds a schismatic, but said little to the purpose; that the King treated the bishops haughtily, but was kind and caressing to Dr. Reynolds; that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, kneeling to the King, entreated his Majesty to take their cause into his own hands, and put such an end to it as might not

injure their reputation[1]." Neal, of course, has given *his own* account of it, in which he makes his remarks to bear against Dr. Barlow's narrative, and insinuates, on the authority of a Puritan minister, that Barlow repented on his death-bed of the injustice he had done the Nonconformists: forgetting that the Dean's narrative would not have been published at all, had it not been necessary for his own vindication[2].

After this a proclamation was issued by the king for uniformity in discipline and worship; and thus

[1] I quote another specimen of the Puritan historian's candour in his authorities. "The Account of the Conference," says he, "was published only by Dr. Barlow, who being a party-man, (says Fuller), set a sharp edge on his own, and a blunt one on his adversaries' weapons." (Vol. ii. p. 11.) Now, from this we naturally would conclude, that these are Fuller's exact words, and bearing quite to the point; but no such thing. Neal was not over-scrupulous in giving new and *improved* versions of his quotations. The passage in Fuller is simply this: after remarking that the Puritans complained that only Dr. B., their professed enemy, (there is nothing about *party-man*) had given a narration of the affair, to their own disadvantage,—"and when the Israelites," says Fuller, "go down to the Philistines, to whet all their own tools, no wonder if they set a sharp edge on their own, and a *blunt* one on their enemies' weapons." (Book x. p. 21.) Comment is needless, when these two passages are compared. It is no doubt a trifling circumstance, yet it goes far to let us know the method of the Puritans in taking advantage of their authors.

[2] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 683. The object of Dr. Barlow's publication was to remove the aspersions which were cast on himself and some prelates, particularly the Primate, and the Bishops of London and Winchester.

the Puritans retired from the Conference completely overcome. No doubt they craved time to give in their answers, but this was the result of their cause, that they must have time to reflect before they came to a decision. On the whole, therefore, the sentiments of the royal proclamation were rigidly just: "that they (the Nonconformists) did absolutely use a form of prayer of their own; held assemblies without authority; and did other things, carrying a very apparent shew of sedition more than zeal: that the success of the Conference was that, which happens to many other things, which give great expectation before they are closely examined: that he found strong remonstrances supported by such slender proofs, that both himself and his council perceived there was no ground for any change in those things which were loudly clamoured against: that the Book of Common Prayer, and the doctrine of the Established Church, were both unexceptionable; and as to the rites and ceremonies, they had the practice of the primitive Church to plead in their defence: and, lastly, that notwithstanding, with the consent of the bishops, and other learned men, some passages were rather explained than altered; yet, with a reasonable construction, every thing might very well have stood in its former condition." The king then proceeds to enjoin the use of the Book of Common Prayer on all his subjects, civil and ecclesiastical; and commands offenders to be punished agreeably to the laws of the realm. In fine, he admonishes all his subjects, of what rank soever, not to expect any

alteration in the public service; and that he would give no persons any occasion to presume that his resolution, so maturely settled, could be removed by any frivolous suggestions; neither was he ignorant how much a government must suffer by admitting innovations, and departing from things settled after a thorough debate. And yet, such is the levity of some men, that they are always languishing after change and novelty; insomuch, that were they to be humoured in their inconstancy, they would expose the public management, *and make the administration ridiculous*[1].

In these remarks I feel persuaded that all judicious men will coincide. Our own experience in the ordinary business of life, as well as our observation, must corroborate them; and if this "desultory levity" be observed in common affairs, and be natural to some people, is it not much more likely that in religion, a subject on which, above all others, men disagree, it will be more prevalent? If religious matters must invariably appear different to different individuals, what would be the consequence were every impulse of methodistical enthusiasm to be regarded? But let us hear Neal on this proclamation. "It was a high strain of the prerogative to alter a form of worship established by law merely by a royal proclamation, without consent of parliament or convocation; for by the same authority that his Majesty altered one article in the Li-

[1] Proclamation to the Book of Common Prayer, printed 1615.

turgy, he might set aside the whole; for every sentence was equally established by act of parliament: but this wise monarch made no scruple of dispensing with the laws. However, the validity of all proclamations determining with the king's life, and there being no subsequent act of parliament to establish these amendments, it was argued *very justly* in the next reign that this was not the Liturgy of the Church of England established by law, and consequently not binding upon the clergy." Now, Neal should have told us by whom this was *justly argued,* though we know well it was by one of the most violent republican Puritans. Yet this writer should have established his first assertion, in order to make out an argument, before he laid before us a second, and proved to us wherein James "altered one article in the Liturgy," or what he meant by "one article!" James himself, in his declaration, says, that, *with consent of the bishops and other learned men,* some passages had rather been explained *than altered;* yet, *with a reasonable construction,* every thing might very well have stood in its *former condition;* and, in fact, he had no intention of altering at all. Where, then, consisted the "high straining of the prerogative," or the "altering of a form of worship established by law?" Had the form of worship really been altered, according to the literal meaning of that expression, that is, had there been an alteration from Episcopacy to Popery or Presbytery, it would truly "have been a high strain of the prerogative" to have done so by a royal pro-

clamation merely, "without the consent of the parliament or convocation:" although I may remark by the way, that the Puritan ministers in this Conference, when pressing James to make complete alterations, spoke neither of parliament nor convocation, but fell on their knees before him, and addressed him as if he, in his own person, and by his own command, could alter the ecclesiastical constitution. And had James gratified their desires, whether he consulted the parliament and convocation or not, we should have heard nothing about the "mock conference," or the "high strain of the prerogative;" but, on the contrary, we should have had a complete defence of every step taken in the affair. Such is the inconsistency of the men who have asserted, that the freedom of our country is owing to the rigid adherence of the Puritans to the doctrines of Calvin. But had Neal only read the thirty-seventh Article, he might have seen what the fathers of the English Church meant by the royal prerogative, with which James' conduct was in strict accordance; and as that Article, with the others, had been ratified both by parliament and the convocation in 1571; and as not only the bishops, *and other learned men,* but the privy council (a fact which Neal forgets) were present at this Conference, there was not, in the nature of things, a high straining of the prerogative in this royal proclamation, inasmuch as James acted solely with the power vested in him by the constitution. Had he, I repeat, "altered one article in the Liturgy," with the consent of the

civil and ecclesiastical powers, he would have "strained his prerogative," and acted in direct opposition to the laws. But it does not follow, that the "explaining, rather than altering," to quote from this very proclamation, "some passages," which, "with a reasonable construction," might have "stood in their former condition," is an altering of *articles,* in the meaning which is attached to that expression. In short, James merely modified a few phrases, so far as the language was concerned; but no *article* or doctrine was altered, which Neal either knew, or might have known, had he examined the subject, and compared the royal proclamation with this pretended "straining of the prerogative," and alteration of the Articles.

Much, indeed, might be said on this subject, more especially as the Puritans took occasion to misrepresent this famous Conference, which, had it done nothing more, is entitled to the veneration and gratitude of posterity, for giving rise to the translation of the Holy Scriptures. Meeting, therefore, all Neal's assertions, and reprobating his calumnies, and the falsehoods which he has repeated to serve his purpose, along with his garbled extracts from, and misrepresentations of, the language of his antagonists, his remark is utterly groundless, that if "his Majesty altered one article in the Liturgy, he might set aside the whole." Having seen that he has here perverted truth, by calling the *mere modification* of a sentence, the changing of

an article of religion,—not less ambiguous is the meaning of the next observation, that "*every sentence* was equally established by act of Parliament." Now, this, in effect, is either ignorance or malice, for though the Parliament has ratified all which the Liturgy contains, and has enjoined that it be daily used at morning and evening prayer, yet it has not ratified every individual word, as if there were no other words of the same meaning, or as if the mere modification or explaining of a sentence were the alteration of an article of belief. The prohibition merely is, that no person shall explain away the Articles from their literal and grammatical sense, and force a construction upon them which it was never intended they should admit, to suit his own purposes of private interpretation—a prohibition which is imperatively necessary, seeing the fondness of some men for authority in their religious frenzies. And as to the puerile argument used, it would appear "very justly in the next reign, that this was not the Liturgy of the Church of England, established by law, and consequently not binding upon the clergy," merely, forsooth, because the slight explanation of some sentences had been given in James' reign, it is evident that it was a mere quibble, employed by those violent and fanatical republicans, who were mustering their forces to overturn the civil and ecclesiastical constitution, in which unhappily they too well succeeded. But it was characteristic of

the Puritans, whose determined hostility to the Church, because their Calvinistic prejudices were not gratified, requires no comment.

On the whole, then, the puritanical objections to the Church of England must evidently appear to be weak and trifling. Indeed, they themselves acknowledged that the "common burden of rites and ceremonies" under which they professed "to groan," were in themselves immaterial, and did not affect or endanger salvation. Where, then, was their vantage-ground? Where their justification for that fanatical schism which they were the means of introducing? Where their defence for that alleged spirituality and "godly reformation," about which they clamoured so violently? If they were of little consequence, why not adopt them, since they were agreed to by the whole Church,—if there was nothing in the Scriptures against them, why strain the language of scriptural truth by far-fetched inductions and illustrations to oppose them? They said they were of little consequence; on their own shewing, therefore, they could do no harm: but if they could be proved to have been the practice of the primitive Church, then they must be in themselves not only useful, but laudable, and, if not repugnant to God's holy word, tending to edification. If they were agreed to by the Church in general, ought the greater number to yield to the lesser? The case, in short, stands thus: The Church, after the Reformation, adopted certain rites and ceremonies which were practised in the

apostolical and primitive times, and certainly what was *then* practised is at least entitled to some authority; but a few men start up and argue, that they cannot agree to these things, they find no command for them in the Scriptures, their consciences are wounded, they must be given up. What then? There is no direct authority for the change from the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian; not a single passage is there to support this act of the Church: it is a mere matter of tradition, ought tradition, then, to be rejected because it is so? A Puritan, if he be consistent, must reject it. I could adduce other facts, assented to by the Puritans themselves, which rest merely on tradition, though it is needless; nay, is it not evident, that the ascertaining of the number and extent of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments is a matter of literary research, there not being a single command in these books as to their direct limitation? If, therefore, the individual consciences of a few men were wounded, is that a sufficient reason to justify schism? Ought they not to have known that the opinions of those whom they opposed were just as much entitled to reverence as their own? And was it lawful for them, who were but few in number, to disturb the peace of the Church, and harass the civil power, and, on being defeated, to give utterance to their feelings in foul calumnies and bitter reproaches, when the opinion of the Church was, at least, as good as that of the schismatics? But the wildness of their opinions was too

well known: and their attachment to the Calvinistic novelties met with a deserved opposition. They had some years before been most active instruments in a conspiracy against Elizabeth [1], and now they were again sowing the seeds of national discontent: they were contending, in a word, for an exercise of religion, which, had it been granted, would have been productive of the most fearful absurdities and extravagances.

Had the Puritans soberly weighed the Articles of the Church, they would most probably have reflected before they proceeded to extremities. I know well that the Article to which I am about to refer is unpopular among their admirers, but it does not follow, that, because a proposition is unpopular, it is not true; for the most wholesome truths are generally those which are ill-digested. The 20th Article, then, contains three propositions:— "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in matters of faith. And yet it is *not lawful for the Church* to ordain *any thing* that is *contrary* to *God's word written*, neither may it so expound Scripture at *one place* that it be repugnant to *another*." The truth of these propositions is evident. For what is the Church? The 19th Article answers the question; and therefore, it being "a congregation of professing Chris-

[1] Nichol's Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, p. 195. Bishop Madox's Vindication of the Government, &c. of the Church, p. 394.

tians," met together for the hearing of the word, and the administering of the sacraments, it must be met together under some particular authority, to which all men profess adherence and subjection, when they enter this voluntary association. The authority is that of its divine Founder, and as the Church is "a kingdom not of this world," that is, a spiritual kingdom, set apart from the civil power, and having no connexion with it except as an establishment, not *requiring*, but *demanding* support, both for the moral and spiritual benefit of man, there must be certain officers in that kingdom, and certain degrees, too, as in a temporal kingdom,—the officers to be an order peculiar to themselves, and the degrees to be conferred on them for the government of the Church as a peculiar government. The Church, then, is subject to human laws, because its officers and members are subjects of a civil government, and because "a house divided against itself cannot stand." And when its clergy meet to legislate, they meet by permission, but not in the name, of the prince, because it is his duty to protect all his subjects, as the first magistrate of the nation, whether civil or ecclesiastical. These officers, therefore, have a right to legislate, in virtue of their ordination, to exercise "authority in matters of faith," because they meet in the name of the divine Founder of the Church, if they expound not "one place of holy Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

But from the conduct of the Puritans of this

period, we specially learn the truth, that men have often become violent sticklers for forms, while they forgot more essential concerns; and thus they affected to see a merit placed in things, which had actually none. If, however, they had perused the discourse which is prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer, entitled, "Of Ceremonies, why some may be retained, and others abolished," they would have seen that those very men whom they condemned as being semi-papists, and as wishing to make them "groan under the burden of rites and ceremonies," which, as practised in the Church of England, are simple and edifying, were as devoted Protestants as themselves, as violent enemies of the Church of Rome, as great lovers of truth, of order, and of rightful ecclesiastical government. The difference, however, consisted in this—the moderation and candour rested in the Church, the fanaticism and extravagance were adopted by the Puritans: the former took the vantage-ground of the apostles, prophets, and fathers; the latter had adopted the doctrines of Calvin and his adherents. Now, they might have known that the thirty-fourth Article was an answer to all their scruples; while, if they had been reasonable men, its judicious and solemn warnings were calculated to make them ponder at the threshold of their schism. "It is not necessary," say the venerable compilers, "that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed, according to the diversities of

countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against *God's word.*" Their great apostle, Calvin himself, sets forth this very proposition, and asserts, that the order of ceremonies is not one and the same in all ages and all countries. But the Puritan error, and that indeed of all his Presbyterian followers, lay in wholly rejecting human authority and tradition, though many of the forms which they practise in their own way have no warranty in Scripture; whereas the Church guards against this fanaticism, by adding in this Article, "But whoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like; as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, *and woundeth the conscience of the weak brethren.* Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority." These propositions, in direct accordance with Scripture, and in particular with St. Paul's injunction to Timothy, "to hold fast the form of sound words, and the traditions of the Church," were trampled under foot by the Puritans, who, it must not be disguised, started numerous trifling objections, that their own ecclesiastical discipline might be established, and that

they might succeed in causing the authority of Calvin to supersede that of the fathers, prophets, and apostles, nay, (so far as his polity and some of his tenets were concerned) even that of the holy Scriptures.

From these remarks, an idea may be formed of those troublous times, and of the difficulty of restraining that dangerous spirit of enthusiasm which had already been too widely spread throughout the nation. It was a great and hazardous task, sufficient to overwhelm the reflecting mind; but it was worthy of the effort, even though attended with certain failure and misfortune. Unhappily, the age has not yet arrived when men may be induced by any arguments to think rationally and philosophically on the actions of the past. And what will men not say and do when stimulated by enthusiasm? They actually think that they are fighting in the cause of truth, when they are only gratifying their individual prejudices, and striving to support their cause; mistaking the impulses of enthusiasm for the certain indications of a superior judgment, they spurn the sober inquiry, and subject themselves to a more inglorious slavery of intellect than that which they pretend it is justifiable to oppose. This is not an age in which men, unrestrained by party, gird up their loins, and manfully descend into the arena of argument, combating with the weapons of reason and research: but when that age does arrive, a much better feeling will animate the population at large, than that which our visionary reformers

of the present day augur from their exertions for the dissemination of what they call useful knowledge. It is by making men acquainted with the blessings of religion, that they can be made happy, and that the foundations of real knowledge can be securely laid; not by rejecting faith, and making sense oracular, by sowing the seeds of discontentment among the superficial, or by teaching them to long with ardour, and to rejoice in the overthrow, of the bulwark of the Protestant faith, of the Church of our fathers, and of those establishments and institutions connected with it, which have been all along considered sacred, venerable, and holy.

CHAPTER III.

1604—1606.

Promotion of Laud—James' First Parliament—His Speech—Meeting of the Convocation—Death of Archbishop Whitgift—Notices of his Life—His Character—Laud becomes B.D.—His exercise on that occasion—Dispute with the Puritans—Cardinal Bellarmine—Arguments of Laud—Remarks on his opinions—Story of the Earl of Devonshire—Unfortunate conduct of Laud—His repentance—Is traduced as a Papist—Letter from Bishop Hall—Reflections on Laud's conduct.

During those contentions Laud was residing at Oxford, taking no public share in the transactions between the Church and the Puritans, but a sedulous observer of their effects. He had been chosen Proctor for the University in May 1603, "without," says Wood, "any canvass, or seeking for it[1]," and in September the same year he was appointed chaplain to Charles Blount, Earl of Devonshire[2], a younger brother of William Blount, Lord Mountjoy,

[1] "His brother proctor," says Wood, (Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. col. 121.) "was Mr. Christopher Dale, of Merton College, who being very rigid and severe in his office, and intolerably choleric towards the seniors, he was so much hissed and hooted at in his return to his college, after he had laid down the badges of his office, that it was then usually said, he was proctor, and bore his office, *cum parva-o* Laude."

[2] Diary, p. 2. Heylin says that he was appointed in 1605.

who had distinguished himself in the Irish wars in Queen Elizabeth's reign.

James' first Parliament met on the 19th of March, 1604, at Westminster, on which occasion the King made a long speech to the Lords and Commons[1]. His remarks on religion are curious, and characteristic of the times. "On my first coming into England," he says, "I found three different ways of worshipping God professed. The first is the religion established by law, and which I now profess: the second is that of the Roman Catholic, and the third that of the Puritans. And these novellists I take rather for a sect, than a society of Christians." He then observes, that these last, notwithstanding their differing from us in substantial points were not great, yet their schemes of polity were very untoward: they were so fond of party and levelling, so perpetually remonstrating against all kind of superiority, "that they were always uneasy, and disaffected to the public establishment; for which reason they were scarcely to be endured in a well-regulated commonwealth." He then remarks on the Papists, that he owns the Romish communion for his mother church, though under the disadvantages of blemishes and corruptions. He compassionates the young people amongst them, "who have fallen under unhappy instruction, and been poisoned with ill principles," and suggests that the rest of the laity, who, out of affecta-

[1] Stowe's Annals. Strype's Annals, vol. iv.

tion, passion, or perverseness, have altered their persuasion, and have revolted from our communion, only to embroil the commonwealth, should be looked after, and their obstinacy corrected. The King then condemns the extravagant claims of the Pope, and the unsufferable pretensions of his clergy; and, finally, he cautions the English Roman Catholics not to misapprehend him, or to presume too far upon his lenity, nor ever to entertain any visionary hopes of bringing their persuasion to a public establishment. He bids them assure themselves that, though he is a friend to their persons on account of their dutiful behaviour, yet shall he always continue a mortal enemy to their errors, and make it his business to prosecute and crush their mistakes. For that he should "either countenance or connive at the spreading of their religion, as it now stands, can never be expected upon three accounts. *First,* Such an indulgence cannot be granted without acting against his conscience. *Secondly,* The liberties of the island must suffer by relaxing to such an excess: and, *thirdly,* the crown would be conveyed to his posterity in a worse condition than he found it[1]."

The Convocation met on the following day, but before that time Archbishop Whitgift had departed this life. This distinguished prelate, whom the Puritan historian characterizes as a "severe gover-

[1] Rapin's History of England, vol. ii. p. 261. &c. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 616.

nor of the Church, pressing conformity with great rigour[1]," was born at East Grimsby, in Lincolnshire, about the year 1530[2], and was descended from the ancient family of the Whitgifts, of Whitgift in Yorkshire. He had been placed in his youth under the care of his uncle, Robert Whitgift, who was abbot of the monastery of Wellow, near Grimsby[3], and from him young Whitgift first imbibed unfavourable opinions towards the Romish Church. The abbot, observing his nephew's genius, persuaded his father to send him to St. Anthony's school in London. He resided in St. Paul's Churchyard with his aunt, who being a rigid Papist, often importuned him to attend mass, but having become already a convert to the truths of the Reformation, he withstood all her entreaties; which so exasperated her, that, at length, she turned him out of doors, remarking, "That at first she thought she had received a saint into her house, but now she perceived he was a devil." He was obliged to return to his uncle the abbot, in Lincolnshire, who advised his father to send him to the University. He was accordingly sent to Cambridge in 1548, and entered of Queen's College there, but, not being pleased with the disposition of some members of that society, he removed to Pembroke Hall, and placed himself under the tuition of the famous John

[1] Neal's Hist. of Puritans, vol. ii. p. 26.

[2] Sir George Paul's Life of Whitgift, p. 2.

[3] Strype's Life of Whitgift, in Appendix, No. I. fol. edit. 1711.

Bradford, the martyr, who had been previously chosen Fellow. He was soon recommended by Bradford and Grindall, (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, but then Fellow) to the celebrated Nicholas Ridley, the martyr, through whose influence he was appointed Scholar of Pembroke Hall, and Bible Clerk. In 1553-4, he became Bachelor of Arts, and on the 31st of May, 1555, he was admitted Fellow of Peter-house, to which he had been unanimously elected. He commenced Master of Arts in 1557, about which period he was overtaken by a severe illness; and on his recovery, happened the famous visitation of the University under Cardinal Pole, to extirpate all the heretics who were found there. He at first thought of retreating to the Continent, to escape imprisonment, but having secured the friendship of Dr. Perne, the Master of his College, though a violent papist, that ecclesiastic undertook to shelter him from the Commissioners, if he promised not to leave the University. Perne kept his promise, and Whitgift escaped without any enquiry, notwithstanding the vigilance of the commissioners. In 1560 he took holy orders, and preached his first sermon in St. Mary's Church before the University, from the passage, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." In this year he was appointed Chaplain to Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, who gave him the rectory of Feversham, in Cambridgeshire. In 1563, he commenced Bachelor of Divinity, and in that year he was also appointed Margaret Professor. He acquired so great fame as a preacher, that two years afterwards he was made

one of Elizabeth's chaplains. He shortly afterwards received distinguished marks of favour from the University, having a licence granted him to preach throughout the realm[1], and in the following year his salary was raised from twenty marks to twenty pounds[2]. He was this year also a considerable benefactor to his own College[3], of which, in

[1] This licence he received under the common seal of the University. Those preachers had the privilege of holding livings with their fellowships, which otherwise was not consistent with the statutes of the University.

[2] While Whitgift was Lady Margaret Professor, he lectured throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. His lectures, as we are informed by Sir George Paul, (Life, p. 8.) were prepared for press, but for some reason unknown, they were never published. Strype, in his Life of Whitgift, (Appendix, p. 8.) says, that he saw this manuscript of Dr. Whitgift's, in his own hand-writing, in the possession of Dr. William Payne, minister of Whitechapel, London, which, after the death of that clergyman, was intended to be purchased by Dr. More, Bishop of Ely. Whitgift's thesis for Doctor of Divinity was also contained in this manuscript: the subject of it was, *Papa est ille Antichrist.*

[3] The commemoration-book of Peter-house contains the following notice: "Reverendus Pater, Dom. Joh. Whitgift, Arch. Cant. et socius hujus collegii, dum adhuc erat Rector de Feversham, infra Cantabrigiam, una cum Margaretta relicta Bartholomæi Fulnethy, de eadem villa, dederunt nobis quatuor marcharum pensionem annuam, exeuntem de manerio de Cailes in Elexia, ad sustentationem unius Bibliotistæ." It is dated October 4, 1565. We are not informed as to this Margaret Fulnethy. Strype (p. 3.) says, that he was related to a family of that name. His picture is in the parlour at Peter-house, under which is the following distich on his name in Latin:

"Quod pace, Whitgifte, faves studiisque priorum,
Dat tibi pacis amans *candida dona* Deus."

1567, he was appointed President. His great talents now paved the way for his future preferment. He was soon called from being President of Peterhouse, to be Master of Pembroke Hall, and Regius Professor of Divinity: and, in less than three months, he was called from that place to be Master of Trinity, which appointment he received from the Queen, through the interest of Cecil. This year he became Doctor of Divinity. In December, 1568, Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, gave him a prebend's stall. In 1570, he compiled new statutes for the University, and in this year he procured an order from the Vice-chancellor and Heads of Colleges, prohibiting the famous Cartwright, who was now Margaret Professor, to read his lectures, until he should give satisfaction as to his principles. This the Puritan refusing to do, or at least refusing to renounce his tenets, he was deprived by Whitgift of the professorship, and expelled from his Fellowship in 1572, for not entering into orders at the time appointed by the statute. In 1571, Dr. Whitgift was Vice-chancellor, and University Preacher, and in that year he was also appointed Dean of Lincoln. He was now engaged in the controversies of the Puritans fomented by Cartwright and his associates, and one or two productions of his appeared in reply to lucubrations of the Calvinistic malcontents. On the 24th of March, 1576, he was nominated Bishop of Worcester, and, in virtue of his See, made Vice-president of the Marches of Wales, in the absence

of Sir Henry Sydney, the President. Whitgift continued seven years in this See, exerting himself with the utmost diligence to promote the interests of the Reformation, and on Archbishop Grindal's death, in 1583, he was nominated by the Queen to the See of Canterbury. He now, by the Queen's express order, exerted himself to repress the disorders of the Puritans, who, taking advantage of his predecessor's easiness in that respect, were possessed of a great many ecclesiastical benefices and preferments, in which they were supported by some of the principal men at court. Being high in favour with the Queen, who consulted him on almost every occasion, he had a share in many of the public transactions of her reign; and his exertions for the Church, and for promoting the Reformation of religion, in opposition to the absurdities of Popery, and the extravagances of Puritanism, well entitle him to be held in the utmost reverence. Neal insinuates, that he was afraid of the first Parliament of James, and died with grief before it met, saying, that he would rather give an account of his bishopric to God than man[1]. He had appointed a

[1] This assertion of Neal's (see vol. ii. p. 26, Hist. of the Puritans) is founded on Camden's testimony (*Annal. Reg. Jacob. ad ann.* 1604), who, though he ascribes the Archbishop's death to palsy, expressly declares, that "he died with grief, as he found the king began to contend about the Liturgy, and reckoned some things in it necessary to be altered. "Dum de Liturgia," says Camden, "recepta Rex contendere cœpit, et nonnulla in ea mu-

meeting of the Bishops and other ecclesiastics at Fulham, to confer about the affairs of the Church before the Parliament assembled, on which occasion he caught cold, as he proceeded by water in his barge. On the next Sunday, however, being the first in Lent, he and the Bishop of London held a long discourse with the king at Whitehall, but departing from that place, he fell into a fit, which ended in paralysis, and almost deprived him of speech. The venerable primate was speedily conveyed to Lambeth. On the following Tuesday he was visited by the king, who said to him, "that he would pray to God for his life, and that if he could obtain it, he would think it one of the greatest temporal blessings that could be given him in this kingdom." The aged archbishop would have spoken to the king, but his speech failed him, yet he was heard to repeat distinctly once or twice with great earnestness, and with eyes and hands lifted up, *Pro Ecclesia Dei.* This was the subject which had occupied his whole life, and which was nearest his heart. He died on the 29th of February, 1603-4, in the seventy-third year of his age, and was in-

tanda censuit, Johannes Whitgiftus Archiepiscopus ex mœrore obiit." Saunders, moreover, in his history of King James, asserts, that he used these words on his death-bed: "Et nunc, Domine, exaltata est mea anima, quod in eo tempore succubui, quando mallem episcopatus mei Deo reddere rationem, quam inter homines exercere."—"And now, O Lord, my soul rejoices that I die in a time when I would rather give an account of my bishopric to thee, than exercise it any longer among men."

terred on the 27th of March, in the Parish Church of Croydon, where a monument is erected to his memory[1].

The death of this pious and venerable prelate, who throughout a long life was active in promoting the interests of the Reformed Church, afforded a momentary joy to the Puritan faction. One of their great leaders, the famous Prynne, has traduced his memory, and heaped upon him the most scurrilous abuse[2]. But his excellence ought not to be forgotten by the Church, of which he was the boast and ornament at that momentous period. He was a popular and diligent preacher; his munificence was great, and his benevolence was unbounded, which he shewed by the relief he afforded to various foreigners in distress from France and Germany, recommended by Beza, and also by the large sums which he remitted to the latter from his own purse. Nor was his hospitality less conspicuous than his generosity; he hoarded not the revenues of his diocese, but liberally distributed them among his friends and the poor. The judicious Hooker remarks of him, that "he always governed with that

[1] Sir George Paul's Life of Whitgift. Strype's Life of Whitgift, edit. 1718. Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, in same edition. Regist. Univ. Cantab. and in Strype's Appendix, Nos. I. IV. VI. IX. &c. Regist. Matthæi Archiepiscopi Cantuar. Bancroft's Survey of Discipline. Strype's Life of Grindal, in edit. 1718. Anthony Wood's Fasti. Fuller's Church History, Books ix. and x. and History of Cambridge. Cotton Library, Cleopatra, F. 2. Regist. Whitgift. Camden's Annals.

[2] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 26.

moderation which useth by patience to suppress boldness, and to make them conquer that suffer:" and Strype observes, "that he lived and died in great reputation, and was particularly happy in being highly esteemed for his wisdom, learning, and piety, by both his sovereigns, Elizabeth and James; who both consulted him in all matters relating to the Church, and in all laws and orders which they framed for the salutary government thereof; and likewise took his advice respecting proper men to be placed in the chief situations." This excellent prelate persevered to the end of his life, in the face of much opposition, in devoting his pains, his studies, his learning, and his interest, to the defence of the Church, against the efforts by which its doctrines were assailed by the Papists, and its discipline and constitution by the Puritans[1]."

[1] One or two anecdotes are recorded of this distinguished prelate, which it may be interesting to insert. In his own courts he always behaved with great boldness and resolution. On one occasion, before he was a privy-counsellor, a gentleman who was afraid that he would lose a law-suit, which was before the court, told the Archbishop, that the lords of the council seemed to be of a different opinion from his Grace. "What tellest thou me," said the primate, "of the lords of the council? I tell thee they are in these cases to be advised by us, and not us by them." On other occasions, towards the end of his life, he was wont to observe to his friends, "that two things did help much to make a man confident in good causes, namely, *orbitas* and *senectus;* and, said he, they speed me both." When the French ambassador, Boys Sisi, asked what books the Archbishop had published, that he might purchase them, and read the works of him who was held to be "the peerless prelate for piety and learning in our

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

When the Parliament assembled, and was proceeding to enact laws to promote the interests of the Reformed Church, and, with the Convocation, to restrain the fanaticism of the Puritans, by the establishing of the Book of Canons, which were afterwards ratified by the King under the great seal, the University of Oxford was again in a state of fermentation with religious disputes. In this year, (1604,) on the 6th of July, Laud took his degree of Bachelor of Divinity, and in the exercise which he performed on the occasion, he gave great offence to the Calvinists. I have already observed, that a dispute was occasioned between him and Abbot about the visibility of the Church, which Laud successfully maintained in opposition to the fanciful theory of the latter. This had occasioned no little animosity between them, and accordingly the Puritan party determined not to lose this opportunity of renewing the disputation. The propositions

days," he was answered, that he had only published one or two books in defence of the English ecclesiastical constitution. But when he was told that the Archbishop had founded an hospital and a school, the ambassador immediately exclaimed, "Profecto, hospitale ad sublevandam paupertatem, et schola ad instruendam juventutem, sunt optimi libri quos archiepiscopus aliquis conscribere potuit."—"Truly, an hospital to shelter the poor, and a school to instruct youth, are the best books that an archbishop could publish." Sir George Paul's Life of Whitgift, p. 10. 111. The hospital alluded to is that at Croydon, which he endowed for the maintenance of twenty-eight men and women, and near it is a free-school, with an ample salary for the master.

which Laud laid down and defended were two,—the necessity of baptism, and that there could be no true church without diocesan bishops. The doctrine contained in the first proposition was alleged against him on another occasion, but, in the mean time, he was charged with having taken the greater part of his argument from the works of the famous Cardinal Bellarmine; while Dr. Holland, the divinity professor, violently attacked him on the second, as one who endeavoured to excite discord between the English and the Reformed Churches [1].

The first objection, certainly an instance of foolish prejudice, which was fomented, as Dr. Heylin justly remarks, "as if the doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God, or any necessary truths, were to be renounced, because they are defended by that learned Cardinal," struck, of course, at the very root of Puritanism and Nonconformity. The celebrated ecclesiastic, whose tenets Laud was accused of advocating, had been well-known to the Protestant controversialists; and Bayle informs us, that "most of their learned divines wrote against him for the space of fifty years; their professors, lectures, and theses, made his name resound every where. He was attacked on all sides, and his adversaries did not forget to examine whether he had not afforded weapons which might be turned against

[1] Heylin, Life of Laud, p. 49. Diary, p. 2. Prynne's Canterbury's Doom, p. 29. Trial of Laud, p. 380. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. col. 121

himself[1]. It is the subject of a book which must needs have perplexed him not a little[2]." Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, of the order of the Jesuits, was the best controversialist of his age, and no Jesuit did more for the honour of his order, or maintained, with greater skill, the cause of the Romish Church. He was born in 1542, and died in 1621. Unquestionably Laud was acquainted with the writings of this celebrated man, but it did not follow that he was to reject any just reasonings they contained, because they were the productions of a Romish ecclesiastic. "There are some indiscreet and rash men," says Bayle, "to be found every where, and therefore it is no wonder if some Protestant writers have published falsehoods againt Bellarmine, of which his party took advantage." He was much reviled by the Calvinists in particular, because he wrote against their dogma of predestination, (which, by the way, is a dogma also of the Jansenists,) and because he ventured to call in question some of the assumptions of St. Augustine. He was, indeed, a man admirably adapted for the age in which he lived, and the Calvinists and other sectaries had frequently experienced the severity of his pen. So famous, indeed, was Bellarmine, that whenever the Calvinists or the Lutherans wrote against the Romish Church, they invariably attacked his writings.

[1] Bayle's Dictionary, vol. i. p. 726.

[2] Bellum Jesuiticum, written by Andrew Castorius, and published in 4to. at Basle, in 1594.

"If," says Ancillon[1], "he undertakes to confute the Pelagians, he makes use of all the arguments of those whom he calls Calvinists; if he has to do with the Calvinists, he makes use of the reasons and distinctions of the Pelagians. If he writes against the Anabaptists, concerning the baptism of children, he proves it by Scripture; if he disputes with us about tradition, the baptism of children is one of the points which, he says, seems to prove the necessity of it, and of which the Scriptures do not speak in a convincing manner."

The opinions which Laud advanced in his exercise involved the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, —a doctrine which is taught in Scripture, and which has been held by the Church in every age. It is maintained in all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, of every description: that it is the doctrine of the Church of England is undeniable; it was that of the Church of Scotland, both when that Church was alternately Episcopalian and Presbyterian, so far as the original Confession is conceived, and perhaps the Confession of the present legal Establishment of that country may be included, although the Westminster Assembly of Divines, whose tenets it has adopted, were the first who ventured to call it in question. And the opposition which Laud encountered was a com-

[1] Critical Miscellanies, tom. i. p. 352, quoted by Bayle, vol. i. p. 726.

plete specimen of that diffuse and irreverent feeling which, it must be said, prevails among the Calvinists and other dissenters of the present day, by which they degrade the holy sacraments of the Church into mere signs or commemorative rites, not at all connected with salvation. But it is evident, that if there be no necessity for infant baptism, there is no conformity to the practice of the apostles, and of the Church in all ages: and if that holy sacrament, simple as it is, (and, in our opinion, its simplicity farther proves its efficacy) does not confer regeneration upon the infant, who has committed no actual sin, and the same to the adult who worthily receives it, that is, if it is not only "a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God[1]"—then is it nothing at all, and there is a levelling or degrading of that sacrament which was ordained by our divine Saviour himself, as in-

[1] Article XXVII. It is remarkable that the Church of England, when speaking of Baptism, always employs the words *renatus*, *renati*. The Church *may* be wrong, but such is the fact.

dispensably necessary to be observed in the Church. Thus much is certain, that our Saviour taught a different doctrine to Nicodemus in his admirable discourse, from that which has unfortunately obtained at the present day: and I hesitate not to say, that no opinion can be conceived more unworthy of the holy sacraments, than that they are *mere rites* or *commemorations*, and not, as they are indeed, the ordinary means whereby men obtain salvation.

When it is remembered that Calvin himself, in his Institutes, bears his testimony to the truth of these remarks, it is astonishing that those who profess to adopt his opinions should have exhibited such a lamentable disregard of primitive and scriptural truth. At the same time, however, it must be remarked, that opinions such as those which the Puritans held, are the natural results of the predestinarian tenets. Considering the times, it was not probable that Laud would escape censure for enforcing the Articles of the Church, and it marked the pusillanimity of the Puritan faction, to charge him with adopting Bellarmine's sentiments, as if it were utterly impossible for a Roman Catholic to maintain any scriptural truth. But it is useless to reason with men who are resolved upon opposition, and who eagerly seek after novelties, rejecting the salutary and sober standard of scriptural and rational enquiry.

On his second proposition, that there can be no true church without diocesan bishops, Laud was

virulently attacked by Dr. Holland [1]. This was a startling proposition to the Puritans. As to his arguments for the necessity of infant baptism, he was merely charged, though most unjustly, with adopting Bellarmine's sentiments; but on this point they condescended to enter into debate. It gave great offence to the Calvinists, and it is denounced in no very measured language by his adversary Prynne, in that production of his entitled "Canterburie's Doome." Of course, it struck at the very root of that polity of which the Puritans were so warm admirers, and overturned their famous doctrine of expediency. But it was not the less surprising, that he should have been opposed on this subject by men who professed to be members of the Church of England, even though influenced by the doctrines of Calvin, and violent sticklers for a new reformation. They had all received its ordination, and professed to remain within its pale; and their learning was neither circumscribed nor superficial. For what is it which gives to the Episcopacy of the

[1] Dr. Holland, however, was a very learned man. We are told by Wood, (Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. col. 111.) that "he did not, as some, only sip of learning, or at the best only drink thereof, but was *mersus in libris*; so that the scholar in him drowned almost all other relations. He was esteemed by the precise men of his time, and after, 'another Apollos, mighty in the Scriptures,' and so familiar with the fathers, as if he himself was a father; and in the schoolmen, as if he had been a seraphical doctor." He was born at Ludow, in Shropshire, and died in 1612. He was one of the translators of King James' Bible.

English Church its high character and authority in the eyes of Protestant Europe, and of the world at large? or, were it to fall, could an establishment so meagre and limited as that of Scotland, or could exertions so diffuse, and opinions so jarring and discordant, as those of the English dissenters, prove bulwarks and defences to maintain and protect the reformed religion? It is not because the Church of England is established by law; it is not because that church reckons the princes and nobles of these kingdoms among its sons; it is not because it is vested with a splendor and political importance which ensure for it homage and respect; it is not because among its prelates and clergy there have been, and still are, those whose names will be remembered by latest posterity with veneration and gratitude; but it is because that Church is a portion of that Catholic Church, which retains the discipline and polity of apostolical truth and order; it is because in its ordination it follows the dictates of holy Scripture and the practice of the apostles and the primitive church, in the distinct order of bishops, priests, and deacons, as our Saviour himself set forth in his calling first his twelve disciples, and then in his ordination of the seventy; and as the apostles set forth in their election of another by lot in the room of Judas, who "by transgression fell from his bishopric;" it is because it enforces rigidly that canonical discipline set forth in the General Councils of the Church in the earliest ages. For as the church of the Jews was an hierarchy, so must the

Christian Church be also: the former being the type, the other the substance; the former being the old dispensation, the latter the new, which our Saviour came "to fulfil;" and which hierarchy it can be, and yet, unlike that of the Jews, be "a spiritual kingdom." But it is unnecessary to enter into a train of reasoning to shew the truth of Laud's proposition. The question is, what is the true church? and the answer to this question must not be dictated by enthusiasm, or affected and alleged spirituality.

It was not, therefore, to be expected, that Laud's opinions would pass uncensured by his opponents. The allegations of the Puritans failed to convict him of having employed the arguments of Bellarmine; nevertheless, they were determined not to lose this opportunity of displaying their hostility. A report had already been industriously circulated in the University that he was secretly inclined to Popery, and this insinuation was farther strengthened in the minds of the Puritans by the theme for his Bachelor's degree. The scandal was turned to account by his enemies, who now invariably connected his name with Popery, as if glad of this plausible pretext to declare their hostility. But, in truth, it was the fashion of the Puritans of that age to traduce all those as popishly affected, who did not coincide with their Calvinistic ideas; and Laud received part of that obloquy which was cast on all conscientious defenders of the Church of England, from the sovereign, who was called "a doctrinal Papist," to the humblest member of the Church.

But in the following year, 1605, an affair happened, which made as much noise as the scandal about his being a Papist. It has been already observed, that on the 3d of December, 1603, Laud had been appointed chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire; I now proceed to relate the particulars of an unfortunate transaction, which he remembered with penitence and humiliation in after life. Charles Lord Mountjoy, for his conduct in the Irish wars, had been created Earl of Devonshire by James, a Knight of the Garter, and Lord Deputy of Ireland. This nobleman, before his preferment, when only Sir Charles Blount, had conceived a violent attachment for Lady Penelope Devereux, a daughter of the Earl of Essex, and her beauty and accomplishments had long excited his fondest admiration. This affection was returned by the lady with equal ardour, and promises of marriage at a future period passed between them. Her friends, however, were averse to the alliance, as he was only a younger brother to Lord Mountjoy, having no estate or private fortune, and depending solely on court patronage: they, therefore, absolutely prohibited the intended union of the parties, and compelled her to marry Lord Rich, a nobleman of great fortune and estate, but of disagreeable manners, and no very engaging person. The lady being under the control of her friends, was compelled to this connexion, and Blount, conscious of his want of fortune, was necessarily obliged to submit calmly to the disappointment of his hopes. Had there been any written documents

connected with their mutual engagement, he might have opposed the marriage at law; but, unfortunately for him, all their assurances had been verbal, and there were no witnesses to support his attestations.

It happened, however, as is frequently the case in constrained marriages, that Lady Rich still recollected her affection for her former lover, and the rude behaviour of her husband contributed not a little to preserve this feeling. It is even recorded, that in her endeavours to make Blount acquainted with her disposition towards him, she made her husband the unconscious agent in her guilty communication. The consequence was, that a criminal connexion ensued between Lady Rich and Blount, at first indulged in private meetings, but afterwards publicly, without any disguise: and Blount began to act with more confidence on account of succeeding to his brother's estate, who died about this period. This guilty intercourse had been persevered in for some time, till at length Blount, now Lord Mountjoy, was ordered to Ireland, to assist in repressing the rebellion raised by the Earl of Tyrone: but, during his absence, Lord Rich had discovered the infamy of his lady, and procured a divorce. Mountjoy on his return, crowned with victory, and high in favour with the king, who created him Earl of Devonshire, finding Lady Rich separated from her husband, and having had children by her during their former guilty connexion, thought that in point of honour he could do no less

than marry her, as it had been on his account that she had brought herself into disgrace. He, moreover, imagined, that by this act he would legitimatize his children, according to the doctrine of the civil law[1]. For this purpose he prevailed with Laud, his chaplain, not without many importunate entreaties, to solemnize the marriage, which was accordingly done at Wanstead, in Essex, December 26, 1605, being St. Stephen's day[2].

In this unfortunate affair, it must be remarked, that Laud was solely overcome by the persuasions of his friends, from the dangerous opinion, that, when a divorce ensues, the innocent and the guilty might lawfully remarry, and that the individual who has caused the divorce, might marry the individual divorced. The latter opinion, unquestionably to be condemned, as productive of the most dangerous consequences, and destructive of domestic peace, was, much more than the former, liable to the most serious objections. But Laud, as Dr. Heylin remarks, though that writer does not profess to vindicate him, was not without reasons, and even precedents, to induce him to this affair: though these, it is not denied, were grounded on fallacious principles. He found that assurances of marriage had actually passed between the parties, before the

[1] Some of those children afterwards distinguished themselves. One of them, Mountjoy Blount, became Earl of Newport.

[2] Diary, p. 2. Heylin, p. 52, 53. Prynne's Beviat, p. 2; and Canterbury's Doome, p. 29. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 440.

lady was married to Lord Rich, which, though null in law, as being merely verbal, might, in *foro conscientiæ*, have some weight in procuring his compliance, and he might pity the situation of the parties, who had thus endured the disappointment of their fondest affections, although they took the most guilty means to establish an intercourse. Allowing his sympathy more than his reason to be influenced by the persuasions of his patron, and finding that Lord Rich had procured a final sentence of divorce, for the sake of the children born in this adulterous intercourse, he complied with the request made under such circumstances. There were also three opinions concerning marriages after divorce, maintained by different parties. 1. That such marriages are lawful unto neither party during the life-time of either, which is most positively declared by the Council of Trent, and is therefore the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. 2. That such marriages are lawful to the party wronged, but not to the guilty,—a doctrine which is practised in the present day, and which was maintained by some ancient writers, and some of the Calvinists: and 3. That both the innocent and the guilty party might lawfully marry if they pleased, which was maintained generally by Lutherans, Calvinists, and Roman Catholics. If he suffered himself to be misled, then, by authorities, Laud was not unfurnished with them, as there were three distinct doctrines laid down on the subject: "and though," to adopt the language of Heylin,

" in this case he followed the very worst of the three, yet it may serve for a sufficient argument that he was no Papist, nor cordially inclined to that religion, because he acted so directly against the doctrines and determinations of the Church of Rome. If any other considerations of profit, preferment, or compliance, did prevail upon him, (as perhaps they might) they may with charity be viewed as the common incidences of human frailty, from which the holiest and most learned men cannot plead exemption."

The result of this unfortunate affair was, that the Earl of Devonshire was disgraced at Court, and though he wrote an apology to the king, yet he was never restored to the royal favour. It seems to have made a considerable impression on his mind, and he died the following year. Concerning Laud's conduct in the affair, it is unquestionably true, that no apology can be offered on religious or moral grounds, and it is evident that he acted on an erroneous and unjustifiable principle. Of this, indeed, he was himself sensible[1], and so humbled did he afterwards feel, that, instead of attempting to justify himself, he always observed St. Stephen's day as an annual fast, humbling himself before God, and imploring forgiveness for that great error of his life[2]. It operated

[1] Diary, p. 2. " My cross about the Earl of Devon's marriage, Dec. 26, 1605."

[2] He composed the following prayer on this occasion, as proof of his contrition and piety. (Canterburie's Doome, by Prynne,

also most powerfully against his preferment; for James was so prejudiced against him, that, notwithstanding his contrition, he would not for a long time, listen to any recommendation in his favour. And so long was he upbraided with it by his enemies, that in an after period of his life, in order to counteract their false representations, he was compelled to make the Duke of Buckingham acquainted with the whole affair, in order that

p. 29.) "Behold thy servant, O my God, and in the bowels of thy mercy have compassion upon me. Behold, I am become a reproach to thy holy name, by serving my ambition and the sins of others, which, though I did by the persuasion of other men, yet my own conscience did check and upbraid me in it. Lord, I beseech thee, for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me thy servant, but hear his blood imploring mercies for me. Neither let this marriage prove a divorcing of my soul from thy grace and favour; for much more happy had I been, if being mindful this day, I had suffered martyrdom, as did St. Stephen, the first of martyrs, denying that whether either my less faithful friends, or less godly friends, had pressed upon me. I promised to myself that the darkness would hide me; but that hope soon vanished away: nor doth the light appear more plainly, than that I have committed that foul offence. Even so, O Lord, it pleased thee, of thy infinite mercy, to deject me with this heavy ignominy, that I might learn to seek thy name. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sin to this very day, after so many and such reiterated prayers poured out unto thee from a sorrowful and afflicted spirit. Be merciful unto me; hearken to the prayers of thy humble and dejected servant, and raise me up again, O Lord, that I may not die in this my sin, but that I may live in thee hereafter; and living, evermore rejoice in thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ my Lord and Saviour. Amen."

Charles I. might impartially judge of his conduct[1]. The man who could record in his private papers those failings for which he expressed repentance, who in moments of retirement approached the throne of grace and offered his ardent supplications, and who yearly commemorated his imprudence by solemn fasting and humiliation,—such man displayed a truly Christian spirit, which brooded over its own sorrows, while it soared superior to the injurious attacks of those who delighted to remind him of those "thorns in the flesh." Had his enemies told the truth, and properly represented the whole affair, there would have been perhaps some excuse, but they studiously reminded him of the fact, while they concealed what was most important in extenuation—namely, the previous divorce. Accordingly, Archbishop Abbot, in his Narrative, represents it as if there had been no divorce at all, thereby indulging his prejudices, and exhibiting Laud in the worst possible aspect[2]; and Prynne, that violent enthusiast, of course follows in the same track, as if Laud had solemnized this marriage without the slightest excuse, and in open defiance of the laws of God and man[3].

[1] Heylin, p. 54. Lansdowne MSS. ut sup.

[2] "The first observable act," says Abbot, "which he (Laud) did, was the marrying of the Earl of Devonshire to the lady Rich, when it was notorious to the world, that she had another husband, and the same a nobleman, who had divers children then living by her." Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 440.

[3] Prynne's Breviat, p. 2; and Canterbury's Doom, p. 29.

The next year, 1606, the former scandal, that Laud was inclined to Popery, was renewed with additional acrimony. On the 26th of October he preached a sermon before the University, in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, for which he was vehemently attacked by Dr. Henry Array, the Vice-chancellor for that year, who was a violent Calvinist. What the subject of this sermon was, or on what occasion it was preached, is no where positively recorded; however, it was conceived by Dr. Array to be Popish in its tendency; "the good man," says Heylin, "taking all things to be matter of Popery, which were not held forth unto him in Calvin's Institutes, conceiving that there was as much idolatry in bowing at the name of Jesus, as in worshipping the brazen serpent; and as undoubtedly believing, that Antichrist was begotten on the whore of Babylon, as that Pharez and Zara were begotten on the body of Tamar." During the time that Dr. Array served the office of Vice-chancellor, he shewed himself a zealous Calvinist, and a great defender of the Puritans, in opposition to the members of the Church of England[1]. He wrote a book, entitled, "A Treatise against bowing at the Name of Jesus:" and he was held in great veneration among the Puritan faction for his reputed sanctity and holiness of life, for his learning and gravity, and for the interest he took in the welfare of his College[2]. But Laud, it

[1] Hist. and Antiq. Oxon. lib. i. p. 300. 309. 312. Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 176.

[2] Dr. Henry Array was born in Westmoreland in 1560, edu-

appears, vindicated himself with such ability, that he was not compelled to make a formal retractation of any of his positions, which otherwise, being a subordinate member of the University, he would have been obliged to do[1]. Yet his old adversary, Abbot, took advantage of this commotion, and so openly traduced him as a Papist, that, as Heylin declares he was told by Laud himself, it was reckoned a heresy to speak to him, and a suspicion of heresy to salute him as he walked in the street[2]. This is

cated by the famous Bernard Gilpin, and by him sent to St. Edmund's Hall in 1579, at the age of nineteen. He was afterwards removed to Queen's College, "where," says Wood, "he became 'pauper puer serviens,' that is, a poor serving boy, that waits on the Fellows in the common hall at meals, and in their chambers, and does other servile work about the college." After he became Bachelor, he was made *pauper puer* or *tabardius* and *tabardarius;* and in 1586, Master of Arts and Fellow. About this time he entered into holy orders, and became a popular preacher in the University. In 1594 he was B.D. and four years after he was elected Provost of the College. He died in 1616.

[1] Wood, Hist. and Antiq. ut sup. p. 312. "Nonnulla protulit quæ academicis plerisque, Calvinismo nimirum jam penitus imbutis, superstitionem pontificiam sapere viderentur; quapropter virum ad se accersivit Doctor Array, Vicecancellarius, superque traditâ pro suggesto doctrinâ quæstionem habuit. At vero durante in hebdomadas nonnullas ejusdem eventilatione, ita se demum purgavit Laudus, ut publicam dogmatum suorum retractionem evaserit."

[2] The Puritan historian here writes according to his usual custom. After quoting a passage from Bishop Hall, and Abbot's Narrative, (Rushworth, vol. i. p. 440.) he says, "Heylin confesses, it was thought dangerous to keep him company." (Hist.

an instance of the moderation and charity of the Puritans. The report thus circulated at Oxford, soon reached Cambridge; and one or two members of that University, inclined to Puritanism, "exercised their pens in the way of epistles." Among these, Dr. Hall, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, wrote him a letter, in which he expressed great concern for his inclination to Popery on this occasion. "I would I knew where to find you," said he, "then I could tell how to take direct arms, whereas now I must pore and conjecture. To-day you are in the tents of the Romanists, to-morrow in ours; the next day between both; against both. Our adversaries think you ours, we theirs, your conscience finds you with both, and neither: I flatter you not. This of yours is the worst of all tempers. How long will you halt in this indifferency? Resolve one way, and know at last what you do hold, and what you should. Cast off either your wings or your teeth, and, loathing this bat-like nature, be

of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 155.) Now, in giving this version of the affair, Neal ought not to have written it, as he has done, with the intention to mislead his readers, as if Dr. Heylin coincided with the testimonies of Bishop Hall and Dr. Abbot. He does indeed confess, that it was *thought dangerous to keep his company;* but by whom? not certainly by the whole University, but by Abbot's satellites, and by the enthusiasts of Nonconformity. On reading Neal's observation, it would be natural to conclude, that Laud stood solitary in his opinions. With what pity must Laud have beheld the men, whose minds were so wofully perverted by prejudice! It is not surprising that the recollection of this academical fanaticism operated powerfully in after life.

either a bird or a beast. To die wavering and uncertain, yourself will grant fearful. If you must settle, when begin you? If you must begin, why not now? God crieth with Jehu, Who is on my side, who? Look out at your window to him, and in a resolute courage cast down the Jezebel that hath bewitched you [1]."

An excellent comment might be made on this extract from Dr. Hall's letter, more especially as it has been often retailed by Nonconformist writers; but it is scarcely necessary to offer any remarks. The pious correspondent evidently laboured under the enthusiasm of the times, and one sentence of his epistle generally contradicts another. Nothing

[1] One would imagine that the author of this epistle had Cardinal Bellarmine in his view, and what is said of him by a certain writer. Ancillon's Critical Miscel. of Lit. tom. i. p. 352. apud Bayle, vol. i. p. 726, *note*. "This puts me in mind of the comparison which I have seen somewhere of Bellarmine with a certain African whose name was Leo, whom he himself compares to that amphibious bird of Æsop, which was sometimes a bird and sometimes a fish: a bird, when the king of fishes exacted a tribute; and a fish, when the king of birds exacted it."—"Ut Leo quidam Africanus in Granatensi regno natus, et, postquam subjugatum est illud regnum, in Africam profugus, de se fatetur, Si Afros vitio aliquo notari sentio, me Granatæ natum profiteor; si Granatensis malè audiant, mox Afer sum: Bellarminus certe multo quam ille elegantius aviculam illam imitatur, qui nimirum respondet. (Tom. i. Controv. l. i. 7.) Patres secutos esse septuaginta interpretum editionem, (ut sup. 20. 3.) Esdræ agens, ait Patres secutos esse Hebræos, et tamen illud alterum, notate, quanta vi verborum efferat. Negari (inquit) non potest. Ipse tamen id ipsum loco posteriori negat:"—p. 354.

could be more absurd than this clamour that Laud was popishly inclined. He may be termed any thing in the present day by his modern enemies—high churchman or semi-papist; but the Puritans, every one of whom was a papisto-mastix, unfortunately neglected to exercise their reasoning powers. And why was Laud so reproached? It was not, indeed, because he advocated Popery; thrice had the Puritans attempted to convict him of this, and they had failed: but it was because his mind rose superior to the enthusiasm of the age; it was because he rejected not the good which is to be found commixed with the superstition of Rome; it was because he well understood the whole doctrine and discipline of the Church, and attacked the Papists with their own weapons. On Bishop Hall's own shewing, the Papists rejected him: "our adversaries," says he, "think you ours:" the Puritans of course rejected him; "we think you theirs." Laud, then, was neither Papist nor Puritan in principle. There were in those times, as there are yet, two extremes; Popery and Sectarianism. Laud steered clear of both; he was, therefore, a devoted member of the Church of England, a supporter and strenuous advocate of its doctrines, a defender of its constitution. His object was truth, and the interests of the Reformation; and so zealous was he in the path of duty, that he had no enemies more bitter against him than the members of that church which he was charged with favouring. This conduct, however, seems to be a component part of Noncon-

formity. In the present day, if a Christian be inclined to reason calmly and rationally, he is immediately branded by the visionary zealots of evangelism as being irreligious and careless—a moralist; if he does not incessantly talk about election, faith, and the total wretchedness of man, he is called unsound, Pelagian, or Arminian; if he does not patronise all the fanaticism exhibited at missionary and other meetings (excellent, doubtless, in themselves if rightly conducted), where men meet merely to sound each others' praise, to pay fulsome compliments, to talk bombastic jargon, and "to be seen of men," immediately he is traduced as caring not for the soul, as being unregenerated, "yet in trespasses and sins." And if he be a minister of the Church, how unfortunate is his case? He is calumniated every where as caring for "none of these things." And to such an improvement has the age attained in these weighty matters, that the very women have set themselves up as judges and critics in matters of religious controversy, and he is only accounted the gospel minister who whines about them, and flatters them with compliments on their spiritual perfection.

But if Laud had been a mere worldly priest, as his enemies represented him, if he had merely his own interest in view, and had been in heart a Papist, then did he indeed make a sacrifice by remaining in the Church of England, instead of going over to that of Rome; he would not have remained in the Protestant Church a single hour. Is it said

that he wanted to make it Popish? How absurd is the charge, when throughout a long life, in all his actions and writings, and at the hour of death, he defended the Protestant constitution. His interest at this time in the Church was not so great as to induce him to remain; he had no preferment, but, as Clarendon observes, a poor Fellowship: nor had he hopes of greater, for his concern in the Earl of Devonshire's marriage had completely prejudiced James against him; and this, perhaps, was the reason why he was more than middle-aged before he was promoted. He had few or no powerful friends at court, whose patronage could be extended towards him; and we have yet to learn from his enemies, that he was endowed with a prophetical spirit, by which he could foresee his future grandeur, and wait with patience till he emerged from the cloisters of his venerable University. And when he did obtain preferment, what was it for such a man as he? It was not like that of his adversary, Abbot, who, more fortunate in *his* chaplaincy, stepped almost from the University into a bishopric; but it was an humble benefice, in which he faithfully performed his duty as a parish priest, and from it his advancement was slow and gradual. It was against his worldly interest, therefore, though it was according to his principles, to remain in the Church of England; that Church held out to him no alluring prospect; whereas in the Church of Rome he would have been received with open arms, and would have obtained, perhaps, no small portion of its ecclesias-

tical importance. And, had his enemies reflected for a moment, they would have seen the absurdity of charging a man with Popery for maintaining those grand truths which they admitted in practice, though they denied in theory—the visibility of the church, the necessity of infant baptism, the divine warrant for Episcopacy. These were truths directly opposed to Calvinism in church-polity; but they were truths to which those men who so violently traduced Laud had subscribed, and to which those "new reformers," as professing to be members of the Church of England, although they pretended to desire what they called a "godly reformation," were bound to maintain and defend, if they wished to preserve their consistency; or else to leave a Church, the peace of which they disturbed by their contentions, but which, according to the notions of their modern admirers, "was not worthy of them!"

CHAPTER IV.

1606—1616.

Archbishop Bancroft—His prudent conduct—Laud's preferments—His generosity—Bishop Neile—Hatred of Abbot towards Laud—Friendship of Bishop Neile—Laud is chosen President of St. John's—His election disputed—Decided in his favour by the King—His conduct—Death of Archbishop Bancroft—His character—Inconsistencies of the Puritans—Their inveterate prejudices—Danger and evil of sectarianism—Promotion of Archbishop Abbot—His enthusiasm—Encouragement of the Puritans—Effects of his primacy—His opposition to Laud—Laud's promotion—Dr. Robert Abbot—His sermon against Laud—Gloucester Cathedral—Instructions of the King to the University of Oxford.

Dr. Richard Bancroft succeeded the venerable Whitgift in the See of Canterbury,—a prelate worthy of the government of the Church. His progress at the University of Cambridge, while a student, marked his great abilities; and his preferments, after he left the University, enabled him to display his assiduity in defending the Church against the attacks of enthusiasm[1]. While he was prebendary of Westminster, he had distinguished himself by a sermon preached in 1593, at

[1] Newcourt, Repertorium, &c. Le Neve's Lives and Characters of Protestant Bishops.

St. Paul's Cross, against the Puritans, in which in glowing colours he exhibited their extravagance, their ambition, and the tendency of their principles to mutiny and disorder [1]. In 1597, he had been advanced to the See of London, when he was Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury [2], and from this period he in reality managed the archiepiscopal see, and governed the Church, as Whitgift's declining health had rendered him unfit for business, and his advanced age required an active and efficient coadjutor [3].

Many important events had in the mean time occurred. Religious disputes ran high in that age, and required all the vigilance and activity of the Church to restrain the inciters of them within due bounds. Sufficient indications were given that the reign of fanaticism was fast approaching, when the sectaries, determined no longer to be peaceful members of the state, were resolved to obtain the ascendancy. The turbulence of the Scots had been a source of annoyance to the government, and, stimulated by the furious zeal of the Melvilles and their associates, their conduct had become intolerable, their spirit that of factious demagogues, their seditious principles had been widely diffused throughout the nation [4]. The laws for Episcopacy, I have

[1] Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 609, 610.

[2] Strype's Lives, p. 515.

[3] Fuller's Worthies of England, Lancashire, p. 112.

[4] Spottiswoode's History of the Church of Scotland, book vii.

already observed, had never been repealed in that kingdom, not even in those Parliaments in which the influence of Knox preponderated, nor was the nation at all favourable to Presbyterianism, till Andrew Melville practised in the General Assembly, and induced that ecclesiastical court to legislate on civil affairs. The violent opposition which James experienced, made him summon to London the Melvilles, and others of their associates, that they might answer for their conduct and opposition towards the Episcopal Church. They obeyed the summons, and proceeded to Hampton Court, in September, 1609, when four distinguished men, namely, Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Chichester; Dr. Barlow, Bishop of Rochester; Dr. King, then Dean of Christ Church, and Dr. Buckeridge, already mentioned, were appointed to preach before the King, that they might the more fully explain the doctrine and principles of the Church of England, of which the Scottish Presbyterians were utterly ignorant. Buckeridge, on this occasion, discoursed from Rom. xiii. 1. and discussed in a masterly manner the point of the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. "He handled it," says Archbishop Spottiswoode, who was present at the sermon, "both learnedly and soundly, to the satisfaction of all the hearers; but that the Scottish ministers seemed very much grieved to hear the Pope and the Presbytery

Sanderson's Life of King James. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. Kirkton's Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, Introd. Law's Memorials, edited by C. K. Sharp, Esq

so often equalled in their opposition to sovereign princes[1]." Buckeridge, however, and his able coadjutors, discoursed to men who were above the reach of argument or reason: they made no impression on the Scots, who had resolved, before they set out, to continue in their opposition. The condescension of the king, too, was, of course, repaid by the insolence of Andrew Melville, who, hurried along by his violent temper, forgot that respect which was due to his superiors, and seemed to believe that every man who was not a follower of Calvin was an enemy to the Reformation. For his republican fanaticism, his contempt of the king's authority, and his insolence to Archbishop Bancroft, he was shortly afterwards punished by imprisonment and exile: but though Scotland was deprived of that great apostle of Presbytery, it was not before he had infused his principles among his associates, and taught them the tenets of opposition[2].

Laud was now thirty-four years of age, and he had as yet resided almost constantly at the University. But in this year, 1607, being then Bachelor of Divinity, he received his first preferment, which was the vicarage of Stamford, in Northamptonshire[3],

[1] Spottiswoode's History of the Church of Scotland, book vii. p. 497.

[2] Dr. M'Crie's Life of Andrew Melville, vol. i.

[3] "6th Nov. 1607, Will. Laud, cler. institutus S. T. B. ad vic. perpet. eccl. paroch. de Stamford, ad pres. Tho. Cave, nul, per resign. Robt. Walker, ult. incumb. resign, ante 2 Dec. 1609." Reg. Dove. ep. Petrib.

into which he was inducted on the 13th of November; and in the following April he received the advowson of North Kilworth, in Leicestershire. In the summer of this year he proceeded Doctor of Divinity. While engaged in his parochial duties, he was recommended by Dr. Buckeridge, his former tutor, to Dr. Neile, Bishop of Rochester, a prelate who was well instructed in the history and constitution of the Church, and knew how to distinguish its zealous and sincere defenders. Laud was appointed one of his chaplains, August 5, 1608, and was received into his confidence, on which occasion he exchanged his living of North Kilworth for the rectory of West Tilbury, in Essex, into which he was inducted on the 28th of October, 1609[1], that he might be near his friend and patron[2]. He had, however, previous to this, on the 17th of September, preached his first sermon before King James at Theobalds. Next year, on the 25th of May, he was presented by Bishop Neile to the living of Cuckstone, in Kent; on account of which, on the 2d of October, he re-

[1] "1609, 26 Oct. Will. Laud, cler. admiss. ad ecclesiam de West Tilbury, per resign. Joh. Boake, S. T. B. ad pres. regis." Reg. Bancroft, Ep. London.

[2] Diary, p. 2. Lloyd's Memoires, p. 226, and State Worthies of England, Lond. 12mo. edit. 1670. Fuller's Church History, book x. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 121. Heylin, p. 55. Prynne's Life and Trial of Laud, p. 2.—Prynne says, Laud was inducted into Stamford on Nov. 16. Laud, in his own Diary, says Nov. 13.

signed his Fellowship in St. John's, and resided on his benefice [1].

The generosity of Dr. Laud's disposition was remarkably conspicuous in those minor preferments. We are informed by an author, that he was no sooner invested in any of those livings than he gave twelve poor people an annual allowance out of them, besides "his constant practice of repairing the houses, and furnishing the churches, wheresoever he came [2]." His parish duties, too, he discharged with zealous assiduity, faithfully expounding to his hearers the doctrines of the Church of England, and in all things exhibiting a conduct worthy of a man who assumes the important office of a parish priest.

While at Cuckstone, Laud was attacked by an ague, brought on by the unhealthiness of the place, which confined him two months. He was, after his recovery, compelled to exchange this benefice for that of Norton, one of less value, but more agreeably situated. In the mean time his friend and patron, Bishop Neile, was removed to the see of Lichfield, and that prelate was not forgetful of his chaplain on this occasion; for having held the Deanery of Westminster *in commendam* with the see of Rochester, before he resigned it, he recommended Laud so powerfully to the king, that he obtained for him a prebend's stall in that cathedral. His preceptor,

[1] Diary, p. 3. Lloyd, Heylin, Fuller, &c. ut sup. Rapin's History of England. vol. ii. fol. Camden's Annals. Chalmers' Biography. Original MS. of Dr. Heylin, Lansdowne MSS. 721.

[2] Lloyd's Memoires, p. 228.

too, Dr. Buckeridge, having succeeded Bishop Neile in the see of Rochester, retained towards him the warmest friendship, on account of his great talents and attachment to the Church. Thus did Providence, notwithstanding Laud's many enemies, and the numerous slanders which they sent abroad against him, pave the way for his future advancement, and prove him worthy of the patronage of his venerable and distinguished superiors.

The promotion of Dr. Buckeridge occasioned his resignation of the Presidency of St. John's College, which happened during the time that Laud was confined at Cuckstone by the ague. He had often ardently wished for an influential situation in the University, which would enable him to suppress those disorders which the Puritan faction, under the fostering auspices of Abbot, were daily making more prevalent. Bishop Buckeridge had corresponded with him on the subject, and was determined to support a man as his successor, who had remained unmoved amidst all the slanders and persecutions of the Calvinists. Accordingly, Laud stood candidate for the Presidency of St. John's; but, as there was a considerable probability of his success, Dr. Robert Abbot, who had by this time been promoted to the see of Lichfield and Coventry in the room of Dr. Neile, who had been again translated to the see of Lincoln, resolved by every exertion to thwart his success, suspecting and fearing the promotion of his opponent. "So natural a thing it is," as Heylin well observes, "to hate the man whom

we have wronged; to keep him down, whom we have any cause to fear, when we have him in our power." For this purpose, Abbot, indefatigable in his opposition, made heavy complaints against him to Lord Ellesmere, High Chancellor of the kingdom, who had unfortunately been chosen Chancellor of the University. The substance of Abbot's insinuations was the old report of Laud's popish inclinations. He alleged that "he was a Papist at heart, and cordially addicted to Popery;" that "he kept company with real and suspected Papists;" and that, "if he were suffered to have any place of government in the University, it would undoubtedly turn to the great detriment of religion, and the dishonour of his Lordship." The Chancellor, believing Abbot's representations, immediately informed the king; and thus his chance of election was almost frustrated.

But Bishop Neile did not desert Laud on this occasion. Knowing well the falsehood of those insinuations, he nobly defended him to the king, and happily succeeded in removing the royal prejudice. Laud was so fortunate as to secure a majority of the votes of the Fellows, and he was accordingly elected President of St. John's on the 10th of May, 1611, during the time of his illness at London. The enmity of the faction against him, however, did not stop here; "though," as he himself says, "he made no party then, for four being in nomination for that headship, he lay then so sick at London, that he was neither able to go to Oxford, nor so much as write

to his friends about it[1]." In his Diary, when recording this affair, he justly charges Abbot with being the cause of all his troubles[2]. His enemies quarrelled at his election, and he found more opposition than he at first expected; for being opposed by another candidate, named Rawlinson, Fellow of St. John's, and afterwards Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, after the election had been declared in Laud's favour, one of the other party snatched the paper containing the scrutiny, and tore it to pieces. Laud's enemies took advantage of this circumstance, and appealed to the King, thinking, from what Abbot had reported through the medium of Lord Ellesmere, that his Majesty would decide in their favour. This appeal was heard by James at Tichbourne, in Hampshire, as he was returning from an excursion to the western counties, on the 28th of August. Both parties were heard for the space of three hours, and, after a full investigation of the proofs adduced on both sides, Laud's election was confirmed, to the great mortification of Abbot and his friends. The affirmation of the election, we are informed, was given on St. John Baptist's day, the Saint after whom the College had been named by the munificent founder, which, because St. John the Baptist was beheaded, was looked upon afterwards by Laud's fanatical and superstitious enemies, who eagerly caught at every

[1] Answer of Laud to the Speech of William Lord Say and Sele touching the Liturgy, edit. 1695, p. 474.

[2] Diary, p. 3.

thing to gratify their malice, as a prognostication of the death which its new President was to suffer.

Laud's election being thus finally ratified by the king, he was admitted President of St. John's, and, in the exercise of his duty, he was compelled to make an example of some of those who had abetted the disorders by tearing the paper containing the scrutiny of election. The principal individual was of course selected, and here the conduct of the President, and that of his enemies, afford a striking contrast. Although the member had committed an act which would have justified expulsion, or at least some very severe sentence, yet Laud, knowing his talents, not only pardoned him, but bestowed on him special marks of favour, made him his chaplain, "preferred him," says Heylin, "from one good benefice to another, married him to his brother's daughter, and finally promoted him to the very Presidency which had been the first cause of the breach, and to one of the best deaneries in the kingdom." Such was the magnanimity of this great man, who, in every action of his life, rose superior to the petty distinctions of party, even when injured and calumniated. "To the other Fellows," continues this writer, "who had opposed him in his election to that place, he always shewed a fair and equal countenance, hoping to gain them by degrees; but if he found any of them to be untractable, not easily to be gained by favours, he would find some handsome way or other to remove them out of the College, that others, not engaged upon either side, might

succeed in their places. But, notwithstanding all this care, the faction still held up against him, the younger fry inclining to the same side which had been taken by their tutors."

Laud, however, was not to be overcome, and, exercising his accustomed patience and moderation, in November following, by his wise and prudent choice of the officers belonging to the College, he at length succeeded in reducing this spirit of factious turbulence. In this month, too, his Puritan enemies were farther mortified by the conduct of the king; for, through the influence of Bishop Neile, his constant friend, he was admitted one of the royal chaplains. But whilst Laud had been combating with his enemies at Oxford, the venerable Bancroft departed this life on the 2d of November, 1610, after having occupied the see of Canterbury little more than six years. With him, it has been too truly remarked, died the uniformity of the Church of England. He died of the stone, at his palace of Lambeth, in the 64th year of his age[1].

[1] His body, according to his orders, was buried in the chancel of Lambeth Church, and on the flat stone over his grave there is the following inscription:—(Stowe's Survey, &c. of London, p. 790.)

VOLENTE DEO.

Hic jacet Ricardus Bancroft, S. Theologiæ
Professor, Episcopus Londinensis primo,
Deinde Cantuarensis Archiepiscopus, et
Regi Jacobo secretioribus Conciliis obiit
Secundo Novembris, An. Dom. 1610. Ætat. suæ 67.

VOLENTE DEO.

He was a rigid defender of the Church, a vigilant governor and disciplinarian, learned in controversial theology, an admirable preacher, and a distinguished statesman. In his famous sermon against the Puritans, there is an elegance of style, an eloquence, and a logical arrangement, which prove him to have been a master in composition. His character is of course traduced by the Puritan historian, who says, he was a "divine of a rough temper, a perfect creature of the prerogative, and a declared enemy of the religious and civil liberties of the country[1]." And again, "This prelate left behind him no extraordinary character for piety, learning, hospitality, or any other episcopal quality[2]." The same invective has been repeated by similar writers, in order that they might justify the excesses of their friends[3]. Among our general historians, too, there are found

He left his library to the Archbishops his successors for ever, upon condition that his successor would leave it as he found it, and if not, he left it to Chelsea College, then building, on condition of its being finished at a certain time, and if not, to the University of Cambridge. Whether Abbot and Laud, his successors, gave the security, does not appear, but the library remained at Lambeth till the Commonwealth, when, by the failure of Chelsea College, and the fall of the Church establishment, it was acquired by the University of Cambridge. It was retained there till after the Restoration, when Archbishop Juxon demanded this splendid library, and his successor, Archbishop Sheldon, succeeded in getting it restored to Lambeth Palace.

[1] History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 41.

[2] Ibid. ut sup. p. 91.

[3] Messrs. Bogue and Bennet, in their History of Dissenters, vol. iii. M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. i.

enemies to his memory; by one he is called the *fiery Bancroft*[1]; and the author of the "Altar of Damascus" has contributed his share of abuse[2]. Another writer says, that "Bancroft filled the see of Canterbury with no extraordinary reputation: he had extreme high notions of government in Church and State, and was strongly suspected of having cherished the king's disposition to assume a power above the laws and constitution of the country. He was most certainly a greater friend to prerogative than to liberty; and what with the want of an hospitality that became a bishop, what with the roughness of his temper, and his high and arbitrary notions, he was but little regarded in his station as the head of the Church[3]." It is amusing to observe, however, the contradictions of these writers. They ascribe to an exercise of what they call arbi-

[1] Confessional, p. 277, 278, 279.

[2] He says, that when the Primate enforced the strict observance of all the Festivals of the Church, &c. according to the first Service-Book of Edward VI. by compelling the clergy to subscribe over again the three Articles of Whitgift, which, by the 36th canon, they were obliged to declare they did willingly and from the heart, 300 ministers were deprived or silenced, either by banishment, excommunication, or imprisonment. The number, however, is grossly exaggerated, for, from the lists given in by Bancroft before his death, it appears that not more than forty-nine were deprived in any way. This, in a kingdom such as England, and in that age, was no great number; but perhaps the worthy writer, in order to make out a case, comprehended all those who were indulging in scruples.

[3] Warner's Eccles. Hist. of Eng. fol. 1759, vol. ii. p. 496, 497.

trary power, whatever influence a man high in station, whom they chose to vilify, may have possessed. This author, nevertheless, makes the following admission, which it is but fair to quote: "If we read of no extraordinary virtues in this prelate, it is certain that there are no vices laid to his charge by those who did not esteem him, but cruelty and covetousness, which, when they are examined narrowly into, appear not to deserve those names in the strictest acceptation. In short, there have been archbishops who have been much worse than Bancroft, who, by their good humour and generosity, have been more esteemed when living, and more lamented at their death[1]."

Amidst the jarring testimonies of prejudice and passion, occasioned, for the most part, by keen disappointment and neglect, it is extremely difficult to ascertain truth. The private feelings of such a writer are minutely recorded, and the passions which he cherished deprive him of that faculty of investigation as to motives, which must first be noted before we predicate any thing of actions. Accordingly we find, that the Puritan writers and their modern defenders, one and all, pursue the same beaten track, and, determined to condemn a man who did not espouse their cause, and who was actuated by conscientious motives much more than they pretended to be, they took every advantage to establish their conclusions; and, when every

[1] Warner's Eccles. Hist. of Eng. vol. ii. p. 496, 497.

other resource failed, they addressed themselves to the prejudices of the people, and began their usual declamations about liberty and popular rights. It is too evident, that the testimonies of Puritans must be received with caution, for, even granting that they were justified in their opposition, what dependence can be placed on men who were stimulated by hatred, disappointment, neglect, enthusiasm, love of novelty, and determined opposition to the civil and ecclesiastical power? Often, indeed, they pretended to wish for fair and manly argument, yet what was their conduct when put to the trial? When challenged to gird up their loins like men, invited to descend into the arena of discussion, and thoroughly contest their points of dispute, did they accept the invitation, or boldly come forward and meet their opponents by sound, scriptural, and rational argument? Had they done so, some respect might have been shewn to their intrepidity, and it were to be wished that at the present time they would give a *sufficient* reason for "the hope that is in them." But, amid the numberless divisions, strifes, and differences of opinion, which characterised the Puritanism of the seventeenth century, and which do still distinguish dissension from the Church, (and Dissension or Sectarianism carries with it the canker-worm of dissatisfaction, discordance, and private interpretation, which eats it in its very vitals,) amid these, I say, we look in vain for any thing like general harmony of opinion on religious matters, and nothing, save a simulta-

neous consent to vilify and oppose the Church and the civil power. I do not deny, that there might be some points which bore hard on the Puritans, and which ought to have been modified, and rendered less severe; but where is the government that is immaculate, or where the church that is faultless in its administration? If they had been successful in modifying the Church to suit their own wishes, would they have made it, if we may judge from the present appearance of Dissent, a harmonious communion, pure and faultless? But their error was, that they rejected all authority in reasoning, they adopted the pernicious system of private interpretation, and where was the barrier to fanaticism? they looked with contempt on human learning, and how could they escape the wild dreams of a heated imagination? they revelled in the visionary fancies of enthusiasm, could their minds, in such a state, reflect and reason with impartiality? Moreover, the Puritans fell into those worst of all errors and extremes, which unfortunately are amply inherited by some sects of the present day,—they forgot that many parts of the sacred Scriptures, although adapted to our instruction and edification, are not applicable to us in our circumstances, but strictly to those who made the transition from paganism and idolatry to Christianity,—they forgot that the apostolic times were widely different from those of the seventeenth century,—and they endeavoured to assimilate every expression which they found in holy Scripture to their own visionary ideas of spirituality.

Could such men, then, violent sticklers for private interpretation, be candid judges, or could it be expected that they would be favourable to those who defended the constitution of the Church against foreign innovation?

Our great authorities, then, in ascertaining the truth on the motives and actions of men in that age of fermentation, are those who write in defence of the Church, for this reason, that *they* had no prejudices to gratify. The power was in their hands, and they were required to exercise it, but to whom were they accountable? Not certainly to the Puritans, who were but a party in the nation. Unmoved by any of those excitements of passion which the Puritans felt, they wrote without any private animosity. Let us then notice the testimonies of other writers concerning Archbishop Bancroft, for it is from the character of the clergy that we can principally arrive at a right knowledge of the state of the Church. "He was," says Camden, "a person of singular courage and prudence in all matters relative to the discipline and establishment of the Church[1]." Fuller observes, that he was an excellent preacher, happy in raising the affections of his auditory, which, having excited, he could preserve till the close of his sermon; and an industrious writer, as his Commentaries on the Five Books of Moses, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and Commandments, with other portions of Scrip-

[1] Camden's Brittanica, by Bishop Gibson, vol. i. col. 242.

ture, testify[1]. "His adversaries," says this old writer, "describe him as a greater statesman than divine, a better divine than preacher, though his printed Sermon testifieth his abilities. I find two faults charged on his memory, cruelty and covetousness. To the first it is confessed he was most stern and stiff to press conformity; but what more usual than for offenders to nickname necessary severity as cruelty? As for his covetousness, he never was observed in his own person to aim at the enriching of his kindred:"—"his clear estate at his death did not exceed six thousand pounds; no great sum to make a single man covetous, who had sat six years in the See of Canterbury, and somewhat longer in London[2]."

[1] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 56, 57.

[2] Wilson, in his Life of King James, (apud Complete Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 10.) "A witty writer," says Fuller, "but more a satirist than a historian," has the following *pasquils* on his memory, for his alleged covetousness, which are worthy of notice, as that writer is hostile to him,

> "Here lies his grace in cold clay clad,
> Who died for want of what he had."

And as the primate at one time cancelled his first *will*, the following distich was published:

> "He who never repented of doing ill,
> Repented that once he had made a good will."

Fuller, in treating this primate as a great statesman, and the grand champion of church discipline, observes farther, "No wonder if those who were *silenced* by him in the church were *loud* against him in other places. David speaketh of poison under other men's lips. The Bishop tasted plentifully thereof

Abbot, Laud's violent enemy, succeeded Bancroft in the primacy, of whom more particular mention will be made hereafter. "He was promoted to Canterbury," says Lord Clarendon, "upon the never enough lamented death of Dr. Bancroft, that metropolitan who understood the church excel-

from the mouths of his enemies, till at last he was so habituated to poisons, (as Mithridates) that they became food to him. Once, a gentleman coming to meet him, presented him with a libel which he found posted on his door: but he, nothing moved thereat, said, "Cast it beside an hundred more which lie here in an heap in my chamber." Other two anecdotes I may give, the first of which shews that he was not so severe as the Puritans aver. A clergyman, who was on the point of being deprived, declared to him that he could not conform. "How will you live," asked the primate, "if put out of your benefice?" The clergyman replied, that he had no other resource than to beg, and resign himself to Providence. "You will not need to do that," said the Archbishop; "come to me, and I will take order for your maintenance."—Some courtiers, during Elizabeth's reign, indulging in gambling above their incomes, solaced themselves with the hope, *solvat ecclesia*, the church will pay all. Bancroft, then Bishop of London, being informed of this, contrived to disappoint them of some of the church-lands which the queen had been inclined to bestow on them, and left them to pay for their folly as they could out of their own purses.—It is said, that he saved the lands of the bishopric of Durham from being alienated to one of James's Scotch favourites, by his speedy and seasonable interposition.—As to his preferments, when he was promoted to Llandaff, he used to call that bishopric *aff*, because the property had been lost; "thence he was translated to Exeter, thence to Worcester, thence to Heaven."—See Fuller, book x. p. 56, 57. Lansdowne MSS. vol. xlix. of Bishop Kennet's Collections, from 1600—1620, fol. 153. 155. 157.

lently, and had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinist party, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists by and after the Conference at Hampton Court, countenanced men of the greatest parts in learning, and disposed the clergy to a more solid course of study than that to which they had been accustomed; and, if he had lived, would quickly have extinguished all that in England which had been kindled at Geneva; or, if he had been succeeded by Bishop Andrews, Bishop Overall, or any man who understood and loved the Church, that infection would easily have been kept out, which could not afterwards be so easily expelled[1]." In a word, concerning this Primate, his strictness was absolutely necessary; and there is little doubt that, had he lived, the enthusiasm of the times would have been restrained. And we know that his vigilance and activity gave, as Collier expresses it, "a new face to religion;" the services of the Church were performed with reverent devotion, the utmost uniformity prevailed in every part, the Common Prayer was diligently used according to the constitution of the Reformed Church, as set forth in the first years of Elizabeth[2]. And whatever may be said of him, there is this to be kept in remembrance, that his traducers are those whom he silenced for their contumacy, and who took that ignoble

[1] Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, Oxford ed. 1721, vol. i. p. 188.

[2] Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 687, &c.

mode of retaliation, by vilifying his memory with their false aspersions.

This inference of Lord Clarendon is worthy of particular notice, for never was the Church of England in greater peril than at this juncture. Surrounded by enemies without, and attacked by traitors within, every thing depended on the disposition of the Metropolitan. It was unfortunate for the Church that Abbot succeeded; certain it is that the Puritan faction from this period gained a complete victory, and during his primacy arose those evils which were entailed on his successor. We have already observed his conduct towards Laud, whom he pursued with unrelenting opposition, raising unfounded calumnies against him, and taking every advantage to blast his prospects and reputation. He had indeed failed; still, what was to be expected from a Metropolitan who had always signalised himself as a violent Puritan leader? Was it not evident, that protection and patronage would be awarded to all who went to those extremes into which his party fell while he was a resident in the University, and which, in truth, he openly declared, by the share which he took in opposing Laud's election to the Presidency of St. John's? He is characterised as being "a sound Protestant, a thorough Calvinist, an avowed enemy to Popery, and even suspected of Puritanism[1];" as if no one could be a "sound Pro-

[1] Neal's Hist. of Puritans, vol. ii. p. 93.

testant," and "an avowed enemy to Popery," who was not a follower of Calvin, and inclined to the Puritan extravagances. Abbot was doubtless a good and a learned man, but he was not attached to the Church of England. "He considered," says the noble author already quoted, "the Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled Popery, and valued those men most who did that most furiously. He enquired but little after the strict observance of the discipline of the Church, or conformity to the Articles or Canons established, and did not think so ill of the (Presbyterian) discipline as he ought to have done; but if men prudently forbore a public reviling at the hierarchy and ecclesiastical government, they were secure from any inquisition from him, and were equally preferred. His house was a sanctuary to the most eminent of the factious party, and he licensed their pernicious writings[1]."

The advancement of Abbot could not have been beheld by Laud, and all true members of the Church of England, without great apprehensions. Bancroft had restrained the turbulence of the Nonconformists; and even in Scotland the minions of discontentment were not very numerous. But that spirit was only slumbering, which was to rise with increased fury. Abbot, in fact, was not well instructed in the constitution of the Church, and his strong attachment to Calvinism made him disregard its divine authority.

[1] Clarendon, ut sup.

His learning was extensive and profound, yet he did not direct it at all times with candour in a fair discussion. It has been remarked of him, that he received one preferment after another until he had reached the primacy, before he thoroughly understood the duties of a parish priest; whereas, his episcopal cotemporaries had gone through all the degrees in the Church before they had been promoted to their respective Sees. The first occasion of his advancement was at the period of his journey into Scotland, in 1606; for from this period must be dated his extraordinary elevation from the Deanery of Winchester to the see of Canterbury, in little more than three years. On the death of his first patron, Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset, he was so fortunate as to be appointed chaplain to George Hume, Earl of Dunbar, Treasurer of Scotland, one of James' favourites, but perhaps the wisest and the best of those favourites whom the monarch selected from his native kingdom. The object of Abbot's journey was to establish a union between the Churches of the two kingdoms, in which, it is admitted, he acted with great prudence and moderation[1]. It was while he was in Scotland that he drew up his Narrative of the trial of George Sprot, for his concern in the famous Gowry conspiracy,

[1] Calderwood, fol. 1680, p. 588, 589. Heylin's Hist. of the Presbyterians, 1672, p. 383. Life of Laud, p. 64. Speed's History of Great Britain, book x. fol. 1227. Petrie's Compendious History of the Catholic Church, &c. folio. Hague, 1662, vol. iii. p. 554.

at whose trial Abbot was present[1]. His remarks on that occasion secured for him the favour of James, and, as that prince knew well the turbulence and fanaticism of the Scots at that period, he conceived a very high opinion of Abbot's genius and ability. Having been further consulted by James on a political mediation between the crown of Spain and the States of Holland[2], he received on that occasion a singularly confidential letter from the monarch[3]. In 1609, he was promoted to the Bishopric of Lichfield, in 1610, to that of London, and in 1611, on the death of Bancroft, he was removed to the primacy of Canterbury; thus, before the age of fifty years, he was entrusted with the government of the Church,—promotions, per-

[1] The Examinations, Arraignment, and Conviction of Geo. Sprot, Notary at Ayemouth, together with his constant and extraordinary behaviour at his death, in Edinburgh, Aug. 12, 1600. Written and set forth by Sir William Hart, Knight, Lord Justice of Scotland, whereby appeareth the treasonable device betwixt John Earl of Gowry, and Robert Logan of Restalrig, (commonly called Lesterig,) plotted by them for the cruel murthering of our most gracious Sovereign. Before which treatise is prefixed also a Preface, written by Geo. Abbot, Doctor in Divinity, and Dean of Winchester, who was present at the said Sprot's execution. London, printed by M. Bradwood, for William Apsley, 1608, 4to. pp. 60.; the Preface extends to thirty-eight pages.

[2] Wilson's King James, p. 37. Camden's Annals, ad an. 1609. Sanderson, 561.

[3] Sherlock's (Master of the Temple) Vindication, &c. in answer to Dr. Sherlock, p. 4. New Observator, vol. iii. No. 12.

haps, unexampled since the era of the Reformation[1].

The bishops about the court had desired the promotion of the celebrated Launcelot Andrews, then Bishop of Ely[2], and they perhaps calculated with too much security upon the king's known attachment to that distinguished man, without making much exertion. "The world," we are informed, "wanted learning to know how learned he was, so skilled in all (especially oriental) languages, that some conceived he might, if then living, almost have served as an interpreter general in the confusion of tongues[3]." His integrity, uprightness, and determined adherence to the constitution of the Church were also well known, though his memory has not escaped the insolent attacks of the Puritan faction[4]. But the King's favour for Abbot was either too recent, or the Earl of Dunbar's interest succeeded in securing his nomination.

A certain author has said of this primate, that "honest Abbot could not flatter[5]." But Abbot was not wanting in flattery towards his royal master, as the following passage, extracted from the pamphlet already referred to, testifies, and which it does

[1] Regist. Bancroft, fol. p. 96. Godwin, de Præsul. Ang. 4to. London, 1616, p. 225. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. i. col. 735.

[2] Heylin's Hist. of Presbyterians, p. 383.

[3] Fuller's Church Hist. xi. p. 126.

[4] Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 121.

[5] Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors, vol. i. p. 174.

not appear that Walpole had perused. He speaks of James, (and he well knew the monarch's failing,) as one "whose life hath been so immaculate and unspotted in the world, so free from all touch of viciousness and staining imputations, that even malice itself, which leaveth nothing unsearched, could never find true blemish in it, nor cast probable aspersions on it. Zealous as David, learned and wise, the Solomon of our age; religious as Josias, careful of spreading Christ's faith as Constantine the Great, just as Moses, undefiled in all his ways as a Jehoshaphat or Hezekiah, full of clemency as another Theodorus." We are not informed how those opinions were relished by the Puritans, but Abbot's inclination to their cause could make those pretended self-denying and godly men overlook many things. They would not, certainly, be altogether pleased at seeing the "doctrinal Papist" extolled in such language as the preceding, yet not one of them has commented on the sentiments of Abbot, although, had they been the declarations of Laud, or of any other who had opposed their Genevan notions, they would not have passed unnoticed. Abbot, however, with all his Puritanism, was a courtier, and he was not unconcerned about promotion in the Church, notwithstanding his attachment to Nonconformity and Calvinism. Yet, it must be recorded of him, that he was not remarkably ambitious, and his moderation, though ill-directed, ought at least to secure for him respect, in connexion with his learning.

The Puritan historian has a remark, however, on this occasion, which ought not to be omitted. He informs us, that had Abbot's counsels for moderation been followed, the Church would have been saved from the ruin which it brought on itself. But the Church, as Neal admits, did not ruin itself, nor would it have fallen, had it not been for the efforts of those very men, or their successors, whom Abbot patronized, and Laud opposed. If the Church was severe, with what factions was it not surrounded, and how many enemies could it not reckon who would have rejoiced in its utter annihilation? Nor would the Church have been severe, for an inclination to persecution, at least, is no feature of the Church of England, had it not been virulently attacked by a fanatical faction, who continually annoyed its governors by declamations about reformation, according to their tender consciences, Calvinistic dogmas about election and predestination, and a thousand visionary subtleties, which they fancied to be the certain indications of spirituality and evangelism; and not satisfied with expressing their own dissatisfaction, its opponents were zealous in creating a partizanship, and in exciting the turbulent spirit of the people. Conceiving every thing to savour of Popery which was not Calvinistic, they were not sparing in their invectives against all who really could not perceive, either by internal evidence, or by any process of reasoning, the infallible inspiration of Calvin's opinions and writings. The truth, however, is, that the Church did not fall

until it was undermined by a faction whom it had long cherished as vipers in its bosom. Had a prelate succeeded Bancroft in that age of polemical disputation who would have pursued his judicious measures, who can tell but, in all human probability, the dreadful catastrophes of the next reign might have been avoided? The Church had sufficient power to restrain extravagances, but it was a task entailed upon Abbot's successor in the primacy, though by no means too much for his vigorous mind, to combat with the wild and irregular notions of men who had been thrust into benefices by Abbot, and had been strengthening themselves during his life-time, gaining the people, and aiming at popularity. For all men, as we are informed by Lord Clarendon, were promoted equally by Abbot, if they were Calvinists, and inclined to Puritanism: and thus it was that James, notwithstanding his antipathy to the malcontents, unconsciously laid the foundation of future evils in the Church, by the promotion of Abbot, however excellent the new archbishop was in himself as an ecclesiastic, apart from his official duties, and the patronage he awarded to disappointed ambition.

The new primate was Laud's inveterate enemy. The breach between them was now wider; for Laud was not ignorant of his conduct during his election as the President of St. John's. He could not indeed feel otherwise than mortified that he had been traduced as a Papist, and that the scandal had

reached the ears of the king, by the very man who had been its original mover.

Laud, now a chaplain of the court, naturally expected some other preferment, especially when he saw the good fortune of his adversary; and he lingered about the court for three years in this expectation. Abbot's influence, however, retarded his advancement; for he was no farther noticed, and he had adopted the resolution of retiring from the court, and residing altogether at his College. But he sought his constant friend, Bishop Neile, to whom he communicated his resolution. That excellent prelate had been an attentive observer of the state of affairs, and was well aware to whom Laud was indebted for the neglect he experienced; nevertheless, he advised him to wait another year, before he took this decisive step. In the mean time, the Bishop, having bestowed on him the prebendary of Bugden, in the diocese of Lincoln, on December 1, 1615, presented him to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. The Lord Chancellor Ellesmere died in 1616, and Laud saw the wisdom of following the advice of Bishop Neile. James, disregarding the underhand representations of Abbot's party, resolved to bestow some marks of favour on his hitherto neglected chaplain, and, accordingly, he bestowed on him the Deanery of Gloucester then vacant,—a dignity, not of great value, but which was of consequence as establishing his reputation.

Here, however, it is necessary, in order farther to observe the violent antipathy entertained against Laud by the Puritans, to notice their conduct a little before this period. Dr. Holland, Rector of Exeter College, and Regius Professor of Divinity, having died in the year 1612, Dr. Robert Abbot, brother to the archbishop, was appointed his successor. He was a man much more amiable than his brother, and so modest, that he would not even accept the theological chair, until his brother had procured the royal mandate. Nor was he a violent predestinarian, or firm believer in the Calvinistic tenets, at least he was more moderate than his two predecessors in that chair, for he openly expressed his belief in sublapsarianism. He was a learned man, and an eloquent preacher, but of course strongly affected towards the Puritans, as appears from some of his works, particularly his Sermon on the 110th Psalm, entitled "The Exaltation of the Kingdom and Priesthood of Christ," dedicated to Bishop Babington, published at London, 1601; his "Antichristi Demonstratio, contra fabulas pontificias, ineptam Belarmini," &c., dedicated to King James, 1603; and his "Treatise *against Bishops*." Dr. Abbot's moderate Calvinism, however, excited against him the wrath of a host of predestinarians, who, liking nothing which savoured of moderation, were sturdy champions for election and reprobation. Yet, being a dependent on his brother, or, at least, guided very much by his advice, and also favourable to Puritanism, he was of that party

who violently opposed Laud, and now, when he was resident in the University, he thought nothing would be more pleasing to the Calvinistic faction, than to give a proof of his opposition.

On Shrove Sunday, 1614, Laud preached a sermon before the University, in which he touched on some points, about which the Puritans, as usual, took alarm. The cry had been set up against Arminianism, by men, too, who seemingly would not, or could not, understand the meaning of the term, and Laud's opinions were held as either favouring that system, or as completely Popish; for in this last position, the Puritans always took refuge. They either imagined, or affected to imagine, that Popery and Arminianism were synonymous, whereas no two systems are more at variance; and, besides, among the different orders of the Romish Church, there were many who were as violent predestinarians as themselves. The Church of Rome, before the Reformation, was thoroughly Calvinistic [1], in particular the Franciscans, and a considerable number of the Dominicans. Laud, in this sermon, reflected on the Presbyterians with some severity, in which he was completely justified on account of their late proceedings. Dr. Abbot soon got notice of Laud's sermon, at which he felt no small indignation, and he resolved to embrace the first opportunity of exposing his opinions to censure. Accordingly, being Vice-chancellor that

[1] Dean Tucker's Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 81, &c.

year, he preached a sermon in St. Peter's Church on Easter-day, in which he made allusions to Laud, which were at once understood. Laud, then President of St. John's, was not present on this occasion, but he was persuaded by some of his friends to attend at St. Mary's Church on the following Sunday, when the sermon, according to ancient custom, was again to be delivered. He complied, and heard Dr. Abbot abuse him for nearly an hour from the pulpit, and in such an undisguised manner, that he was actually pointed at by the auditors.

The particular passage which Laud objected to was the following—"Some," said Dr. Abbot, "are partly Romish, partly English, as occasion serves them, that a man might say unto them, *noster es, an adversariorum?* who, under pretence of truth, and preaching against the Puritans, strike at the heart and root of the religion now established among us. They cannot plead that they are accounted Papists because they speak against the Puritans, but, because, being indeed Papists, they speak nothing against them. If they do at any time speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it: they speak nothing but that wherein one Papist will speak against another, as against equivocation, the Pope's temporal power, and the like, and, perhaps, some of their blasphemous speeches: but in the points of free-will, justification, concupiscence being a sin after

baptism, inherent righteousness, and certainty of salvation, the Papists beyond the seas can say they are wholly theirs; and the Recusants at home make their boast of them. In all things they keep themselves so near the brink, that upon occasion they may step over to them. Now, for this speech, that the Presbyterians are as bad as the Papists, there is a sting in the speech, which I wish had been left out, for there are many churches beyond the seas, which contend for the religion established among us, and yet have approved and admitted Presbytery." After defending Presbytery for a considerable time, he then exclaimed, "Might not Christ say, What art thou? Romish or English? Papist or Protestant? Or, what art thou? a mongrel compound of both; a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of free-will, inherent righteousness, and the like. A Protestant in receiving the Sacrament, a Papist in the doctrine of the Sacrament. What? Do you think there are two heavens? If there be, get you to the other, and place yourselves there, for unto this where I am ye shall not come[1]."

This is a specimen of the singular eloquence of Dr. Abbot; and because Laud did not hold the opinions of St. Augustine and Calvin about free-will, inherent righteousness, the sacraments, and the polity of the Church, he was condemned from the pulpit of St. Mary's as a Papist. Laud immediately wrote to Bishop Neile, to receive his advice, as he

[1] Heylin, p. 61, 62. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 62.

felt himself almost called upon to answer these scurrilous and false charges. "I came time enough," says Laud to that prelate, "to be at the rehearsal of this sermon, upon much persuasion, where I was fain to sit patiently, and hear myself abused almost an hour together, being pointed at as I sat. For this present abuse I would have fain taken no notice of it, but that the whole University did apply it to me; and my own friends tell me I shall sink my credit, if I answer not Dr. Abbot in his own. Nevertheless, in a business of this kind, I will not be swayed from a patient course; only I desire your Lordship to vouchsafe me a direction what to do." Bishop Neile, however, it would appear, advised him not to excite a quarrel, for the matter went no farther; and as Abbot was soon afterwards promoted to the bishopric of Salisbury, through his brother's influence, though not without considerable opposition, Laud did not think it prudent to engage in a dispute with one who was now advanced to so high a station in the Church. Abbot was succeeded in the divinity chair by the famous Dr. John Prideaux, Rector of Exeter College, "who proved," says Heylin, "a violent assertor of all the Calvinian rigours, in the matter of predestination, and the points depending thereupon, as appears by his first lecture, *De Absoluto Decreto,* and the rest which followed."

After Laud's promotion to the Deanery of Gloucester, he resigned his Rectory of West Tilbury, in Essex. When he received the appointment from

James, he was commanded to reform and set in order what was necessary in that cathedral, for no church in England was so ill governed. Dr. Miles Smith, for his care in the part assigned him in the translation of the Bible, had been advanced to that see. He was a rigid Calvinist, and greatly inclined towards the Puritans, on which account the cathedral, and indeed many of the churches in the diocese, were approximated as near as possible to the appearance of conventicles. Laud, instructed by the king, proceeded to Gloucester, and found the cathedral in a state of decay. He immediately called a chapter of the prebends, in which two acts were passed, the one ordering a speedy repair of the church, the other ordering the removal of the communion table to the east end of the choir, and recommending a becoming reverence and devotional feeling to the clergy and officers of the cathedral when they entered, as had been always the practice of true worshippers, and not to follow the fashion of the Puritans, who were accustomed, like their brethren in Scotland, to treat the churches with the utmost contempt, and to exult in doing so, frequently sitting with their hats on during divine service, and rushing in and out of the church in mobs, without any appearance of reverence for the great Being in whose more immediate presence they had been, thus making an improvement on the passage of Scripture, that "God is not confined to temples made with hands." Those proceedings were beheld with great indignation by the bishop,

who openly expressed his indignation; but he found the new Dean by no means inclined to gratify the enthusiasm of the sectarians in the city of Gloucester. So enraged, indeed, was Dr. Smith, that he declared, unless those acts were revoked, he would never again enter the cathedral while he lived; and he adhered to his resolution. One of his chaplains, however, took up the affair, and endeavoured to excite, through means of seditious letters, a tumult in the city. The Puritans "were grown multitudinous," says Heylin, "by reason of the short stay which the Dean and Prebendaries had made in the city, the dull connivance of their Bishop, and the remiss government of the Metropolitan, so that it seemed both safe and easy to some of the rabble to make an outcry in all places that Popery was introduced—that the transforming of the communion table into an altar, with the worship and obeisance rendered to it, were popish superstitions, and the like." The civil authorities interposed, and after committing some persons to prison, and threatening others for their outrageous disorders, they sent notice to Laud, who immediately wrote to the Bishop of Gloucester, explaining his conduct, and maintaining that he had done nothing contrary to the established practice of the primitive church, and of the Reformed Church of England [1].

Having thus discharged his duty at Gloucester,

[1] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 63—66.

Laud returned to court. In the mean time, his treatment from Dr. Abbot had been represented to James by Bishop Neile, at which the King expressed considerable indignation. A representation was also given of the danger which might in future result to the Church, were such proceedings to pass unnoticed, more especially as the Calvinists at Oxford were diligently training numbers of the students to succeed them in the promulgation of their opinions. After mature deliberation, Laud and the clergy about the court procured directions for the better government of the University, which were dispatched, on the 18th of January, 1616, to the Vice-chancellor and the Heads of Colleges. Those directions, which ought to have been issued some years sooner, contain the first official disapprobation of the tenets of the Calvinists and supralapsarians, as will be seen from their nature. They are to the following effect:—

"1. That it is his Majesty's pleasure, that all who take any degree in schools, subscribe the three articles in the thirty-sixth Canon.

"2. That no preachers be allowed to preach in the town, but such as are every way conformable by subscription, and every other way.

"3. That all students do resort to the sermons at St. Mary's, and be restrained from going to any other church in the time of the sermons at St. Mary's; and that provision be made, that the sermons in St. Mary's be diligently made and performed both before and after noon.

" 4. That the ordinary Divinity Act be constantly kept, with three replicants.

" 5. That there be a greater restraint of scholars haunting town-houses, especially in the night.

" 6. That all scholars, both at the chapels and at the schools, keep their scholastic habits.

" 7. That young students in divinity be directed to study such books as are most agreeable to the Church of England in doctrine and discipline, and excited to bestow their time on the Fathers and Councils, schoolmen, histories, and controversies, and not to insist too long upon compendiums and abbreviatures, making them the grounds of their study in divinity.

" 8. That no man, either in pulpit or schools, be suffered to maintain dogmatically any point of doctrine that is not allowed by the Church of England.

" 9. That the Vice-chancellor, and the two Professors, or two Heads of Houses, do, at such times as his Majesty resorts into those parts, wait upon his Majesty, and give his Majesty a just account how these his Majesty's instructions are observed.

" 10. Let no man presume, of what condition or degree soever, not to yield his obedience to these his Majesty's directions, lest he incur such censures as the statutes of this University may justly inflict upon such transgressors."

These directions, evidently levelled against the Puritans, are, it must be conceded, not altogether justifiable, (although the last is indeed a qualifica-

tion,) inasmuch as they deprived the University of its independence, and subjected it completely to the control of the king. But the state of the times rendered such instructions necessary; and the consternation of the Puritan faction, when they were made known at Oxford, is a proof of the wisdom of the monarch and his advisers, in thus placing a timely restraint on the progress of sectarian partisanship and enthusiasm.

CHAPTER V.

1616—1619.

Remarks on the state of Scotland—James resolves to visit that kingdom—Remarkable violence of the Presbyterian ministers—Proposal for a union between Scotland and England defeated—Consecration of the Scottish Bishops at Westminster—Departure of James—His arrival in Scotland—Laud accompanies him—The Scottish Parliament—The Perth Articles—General Assembly—Ratification of the Perth Articles—Return of James to England—Laud arrives at Oxford—Is inducted into the Rectory of Ibstock—Death of Dr. Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury.

This year King James resolved to undertake a journey into his native kingdom, which he had not visited since his accession to the English crown. He had indeed promised, in his farewell address delivered in the High Church of Edinburgh, that he would visit his *ancient people* every third year, and that, as his good fortune had now made him more powerful, he was more able, and he would be more inclined, to attend to their interests, and to consult their welfare. The tears which were shed, however, by the inhabitants of the Scottish metropolis, when they beheld the representative of their ancient sovereigns finally departing from among them, depriving them of the gaudy splendour of a court, to a kingdom which they not only

considered foreign, but also hostile,—where, in all probability, their own barren and uncultivated country would be speedily forgotten amidst English splendour and the luxuriance of the English plains, were those of deep regret, as resulting from their attachment to the House of Stuart, and from their veneration to their sovereign, who, notwithstanding all their turbulence and rudeness, had continually resided amongst them. The hatred and strife which had been long cherished against their more powerful southern neighbours were not yet forgotten: they recollected the fearful inroads which the English armies had made into their country, and the marks of devastation which they had left behind. The fatal and melancholy disaster of Flodden was within the memory of their parents: and little more than half a century had elapsed since the surrender at Solway, and their complete defeat at Pinkey, by the Marquis of Hertford. Numerous minor engagements, especially on the Borders, had farther tended to increase the mutual exasperation: the English looked on them with contempt, they on the English with hatred: the policy of Elizabeth, her persecution of Mary, and the subserviency of the Regent Moray, had completed their subjection to the English influence, while the Regents who succeeded him were afraid to displease a neighbour so powerful and so dangerous. Not calculating on the advantages which must ensue from a union with a more wealthy neighbour, they imagined that they beheld the independ-

ence of their country, for which their fathers had so nobly and so successfully fought at Bannockburn, and which, during three centuries afterwards, they had guarded with vigilance and determination, at once sacrificed in a manner inglorious to their former renown in arms; not decided by the sword, but controled by a destiny inevitable.

Yet the reformation from Popery had engrossed much of their attention. The Roman Catholics were still a numerous and powerful party, headed by many of the northern chiefs; and religious disputes characterized the age as one of strife, turbulence, and sedition; giving sufficient indications of the approaching reign of violence and religious enthusiasm. The departure of James was forgotten amidst theological contentions: the disciples of Geneva had succeeded in disseminating the Presbyterian notions among the inhabitants of the Lowland counties, particularly the western districts; and had taught the people to behold their sovereign as one who temporized with circumstances, and was inclined to impose on them a Church and a ritual which they conceived little better than Popish. They forgot that the ancient constitution of their Church, before it was subject to the Bishop of Rome, had been thoroughly Episcopal[1], and their fiery leaders failed not to foment

[1] Bishop Lloyd's History of the Church, as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian Religion. Bishop Stillingfleet's Origines Brittanicæ, London, fol. 1685. Goodall's Essay on the Culdees, apud Bishop Keith.

the excitement of feeling by their partial and prejudiced representations. Accordingly, the measures of James in Scotland had been extremely unpopular; the Scots charged him with listening to men who knew nothing of their country, and who judged of its inhabitants from themselves; and they had invariably displayed that determined opposition, which no arguments or concessions of the monarch could induce them to forego.

In the year 1604, a political union of the two kingdoms had been proposed by James to the English Parliament, and Lord Chancellor Ellesmere procured with difficulty the nomination of forty-five commissioners to treat with the Scots[1]. On the 11th of July, in that year, the Scottish Parliament assembled at Perth, who, when the measure was proposed, heard it with alarm and apprehension. An intimation, however, was conveyed to the nobility from James, that a speedy compliance could alone avert his displeasure, and, unable to contend with their sovereign, they yielded with reluctance. Thirty-six commissioners were appointed to meet those of England. But numerous obstacles caused the intended union to be postponed, and afterwards to be finally abandoned[2].

Although the commissioners assembled at Westminster had abandoned the measure as imprac-

[1] King James's Works, p. 159.

[2] MSS. State Papers in the Advoc. Lib. Edin. Spottiswoode, History, p. 318. Journals of the Commons, vol. i. p. 318. Parl. 17. James VI.

ticable, it was still cherished in secret by James. For this purpose, his first intentions were to effect an uniformity of religion—a union of the two churches. James, who was a zealous Episcopalian, was exasperated against the Presbyterians on account of their intolerant spirit; they attempted to justify all their excesses by examples from the Old Testament, and thence they inculcated rigidly on their followers "to go and do likewise." But not the less did he recollect their bitter animosity and hatred towards his mother—how they had defended the murder of the most beautiful princess in Christendom, how they had traduced her memory, and personally insulted himself[1]. The revival of Epis-

[1] On one occasion, James, before the murder of his mother, commanded her to be prayed for in all religious assemblies, and appointed a day of fasting and prayer, on which Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, was to preach. But the Presbyterian ministers, on the day appointed, placed a miserable young fanatic named John Couper, in the pulpit of St. Giles' Church, where the service was to be performed. The king, who was in his own seat, immediately exclaimed, "Master John, that place was designed for another, yet since you are there, do your duty, and obey the charge to pray for my mother." Couper replied, that he would pray as the *Spirit directed him*, and immediately began a tirade of the most abusive invectives against the queen. The king interrupted him, whereupon he thumped the pulpit, exclaiming, "This day shall bear witness against you in the day of the Lord. Woe be to thee, O Edinburgh, for the last of thy plagues shall be the worst;" and immediately he came down from the pulpit, and departed, "*followed by the whole wives in the Kirk.*" Archbishop Spottiswoode's History, p. 354. Sanderson, p. 120.

copacy had been attempted before the Accession, but the preachers discovered it, and opposed it with industrious zeal. They met without permission of the civil power, nay, in direct opposition to it, at Aberdeen, in July, 1605, and constituted a General Assembly, for which act they were punished by the government[1]. Shortly afterwards the Melvilles were summoned to court, to answer for their turbulence, where the "venerable Andrew" in particular, the elder of the brothers, behaved with his accustomed rashness. The sermons of the English clergy were heard with the utmost contempt, the service was beheld with abhorrence, and spoken of with levity. Several epigrams were written to ridicule the Church[2]; one of which, of an ex-

John Welch, another fanatic, whom the enthusiasts believed to have the *gift* of prophecy, was of the same description. Some of his sermons are printed, and are remarkable for his "familiaritie with his Maker." Archbishop Spottiswoode declares, that his common effusions were also abundantly treasonable. In the year 1596 he had the insolence to declare from the pulpit in the High Church of Edinburgh, that "the king was possessed with a devil, and one devil being put out, seven more were entered in place, and that *his subjects might lawfully rise, and take the sword out of his hand.*"—*Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?*

[1] Only nineteen individuals composed this Assembly out of fifty Presbyterians. The majority of the ministers were averse to it. Spottiswoode, Hist. p. 487.

[2] Calderwood's History, p. 537, &c. Spottiswoode's History, p. 500. Calderwood's MS. vol. v. ad an. 1606. Woodrow's MSS. vol. i. folio, in the Library of the University of Glasgow.

tremely reprehensible description, breathing the genuine spirit of Calvinism, had found its way to the king[1]. And when Melville had been summoned before the Council to assign a reason for his licentious freedom, he had not only reviled the Church of England, but had abused Archbishop Bancroft, who was present, because he opposed the extravagancies of Puritanism, blamed him for introducing what those zealots called "corruptions, vanities, and superstitions," into the Church[2], addressed that venerable prelate as the enemy of the Reformed Churches, and, boldly advancing towards him, shook his lawn sleeves, and termed them Romish rags. Such was the insolence of those worthy coadjutors of the English Puritans in the presence of their sovereign, and in contempt of all well-regulated civil authority. But James con-

[1] Calderwood and Wodrow, ut sup. Spottiswoode, p. 500. The following is the Epigram, which has been often printed.

"Cur stant clausi Anglis libri duo, regia in ara,
Lumina cæca duo, pollubra sicca duo?
Num sensum cultumque Dei tenet Anglia clausum
Lumine cæca suo, sorde sepulta sua?
Romano et ritu dum regalem instruit aram
Purpuream purget religiosa lupam."

[2] Spottiswoode, who was present, says (History, p. 500.) that Melville's behaviour was more like that of a madman than a divine. The Dissenting Calvinists invariably followed the notions of their oracle, Calvin, who was pleased to condescend on the Liturgy and Service of the Church, that they were "*tolerabiles ineptiæ!*"

trived to punish them for their insolence, and Andrew Melville, in particular, never returned to the country, the inhabitants of which he had excited by his furious and intolerant zeal.

Various were the disputes which intervened between the years 1606 and 1610, the year in which Archbishop Spottiswoode and the Bishops of Galloway and Brechin were consecrated at Westminster. In 1612, Episcopacy was completely re-established in Scotland, and the prelates shewed their attachment to the Protestant Church by their zealous opposition to Popery, more especially in the prosecution of Ogilvy, a Jesuit, by the Archbishop of Glasgow[1]. They endeavoured, by every expedient, to convince the people of their attachment to, and zeal for, the Church; nor would they have been unsuccessful, had they not been opposed by new zealots.

The promise made by James to visit Scotland every third year had been hitherto unfulfilled, by reason of his negligence and his poverty. At this time, however, he had received a supply of money by his negotiations with the Dutch, and he prepared to perform his engagement. He had not relinquished his hopes of the desired union of the kingdoms, and he naturally thought that his presence might tend to conciliate the people, and further his wise intentions. The king made a careful selection of those who were to accompany him, and Laud

[1] Spottiswoode, p. 521, 522, 523. Calderwood, p. 649.

was included in the number; because, besides the favour which he at this time enjoyed, his well-known abilities might be of service among the northern enthusiasts. The grand object of the king, in the first instance, was to effect a uniformity in the two Churches; a measure not only expedient, but highly justifiable, especially in times when it had not been discovered, as the experience of the last century has proved, that two separate Protestant establishments may exist in a kingdom united in political force, and yet each have a different ecclesiastical constitution. "In the next century," says Laing, "their posterity discovered, nor was experience necessary to prove, that if the relative obligations to government are the same, uniformity of religious or of municipal laws is not essential to an incorporating union." These opinions, however, must be received with very great limitations, and as only applicable in some instances and in a more enlightened age; for had Presbytery, Puritanism, or Calvinism (for these names are all synonymous) been established in Scotland in the beginning of the seventeenth century, had the enthusiasm of the Scottish votaries of Geneva been gratified, where would have been the security of the Church of England? Leagued as they had been with the Puritans of England, even when they had not thoroughly adopted the order of Calvin, in the reign of Elizabeth, and still more united with them at this time, since they viewed the Puritan cause as their own, and as congenial to their feelings, the constitution of Eng-

land would have fallen, it would have passed, as it latterly did, into the hands of demagogues, who, when they did obtain the mastery both in England and Scotland, were not one whit behind their Popish predecessors in insolence and persecution. And it certainly does ill become factious men of the present day to charge the Church of England with cruelty and intolerance towards the Puritans; since those very factions, as they themselves admit, were striving to overturn the state, under the specious pretence of a tender conscience. The unhappy primacy of Abbot was fostering the dark and daring spirit of Calvinism; men were admitted into the Church who were secretly undermining its foundations. The Church, under this Primacy, was too visibly hastening to its fall; for it had less to fear, as the issue proved, from those *without*, than from those *within*. Hence, then, in general, uniformity of religious laws is absolutely necessary; and it is only because the *legal* church-establishment of Scotland at present is somewhat different from the plan of its first supporters; it is because the insufferable Solemn League and Covenant, that precious specimen of Calvinistic intolerance and rebellion, is suppressed; it is because frequent intercourse with their more learned and more polished neighbours of England has softened the rude asperity and gloomy fanaticism of the descendants of the Covenanters; it is because the rage for covenanting chivalry has passed away, and the consolidated civil laws of Great Britain alike prevail over the religious and muni-

cipal laws of Scotland, which are now in force; it is, in short, because Calvinism has lost its power, and, consequently, is shorn of its intolerance, that two different *Protestant* establishments can co-exist, holding, in general, the same doctrinal truths, and that "uniformity of religious or municipal laws is not essential to an incorporating union."

Laud having been appointed to accompany James, on the 14th day of March, 1617, the monarch began his journey. We are informed, that as he passed through Lincoln, he was magnificently entertained by Laud's constant friend, Dr. Neile, the Bishop of the See. He had previously dispatched commissioners to Scotland, to make some preparations for his arrival; and among the rest, as he did not choose to patronise the rhodomontade and extemporaneous effusions of the Calvinists, or to attend their conventicles, to repair the chapel-royal at the palace of Holyroodhouse, that public worship might be celebrated in it according to the forms of the Episcopal Church. This exercise of conscience the zealots of Edinburgh chose to consider as a remarkable innovation; and seeing a few decorations in the interior of the building, (for it had been almost in a state of dilapidation since the reign of Mary), a report was instantly spread, that mass was to be introduced, and their preachers assisted in publishing the falsehood; so grossly ignorant were they of the Church they reviled. Cowper, Bishop of Galloway, though an amiable man, dean of the chapel-royal, having been formerly a zealous

Calvinist, entered into the feelings of the populace, and wrote to Spottiswoode, who was now in the primacy of St. Andrew's; but the Archbishop justly treated his fears as visionary and groundless. The other bishops, however, succeeded in restraining some of the arrangements in the chapel, for which they were reproved by the king, who ascribed it to their narrow views, and unceremoniously told them, that he would bring with him some English theologians to enlighten their minds.

On the 13th of May the king arrived in Scotland, and was received with the greatest demonstrations of joy. His learning was gratified by an exhibition of pedantry from the Scottish Universities, particularly those of St. Andrew's and Edinburgh; and his wit, by puns on the names of the professors[1]. But the affairs of the Church required his especial care. Although the Episcopal Church was established, and its government thoroughly primitive, yet it retained the Presbyterian form of worship—a form, as Lord Kaimes well expresses it, fit only for philosophers. Its rude simplicity seemed to enthusiasts pure and divine; but to the rational, nothing could be more indecorous and illiberal. The Scottish Church wanted that admirable protection against fanaticism, preservative of vital religion, and defence of sound doctrine, a Liturgy, such as the

[1] The Muse's Welcome to James, Johnston's History, p. 519. Crawford's Account of Edinburgh College, MS. in the Library of that University.

Church of England possessed; and Laud, frequently consulted by James, pressed him to adopt some decisive measures. The king was resolved not to lose sight of his favourite object, and experience had taught him the beneficial effects of a public form of prayer.

The Scottish parliament assembled; the proceedings of which were protested against by three preachers, Simpson, Ewart, and Calderwood the historian. They were summoned to St. Andrew's, and there silenced by deprivation, inasmuch as their protest was reckoned seditious in its interpretation. The king presided in the court, and in passing sentence remarked, that "as long as they were deprived only of their benefices, they stood out, because they preached on, and lived on the benevolence of the people: but when they were deprived of their office, many yielded, and were now the best men in the kingdom: therefore the same course must be adopted with them as with the Puritans." In the mean time, the sermons of the Presbyterians abounded with invectives against the king; and in their prayers they not only condemned the rites and ceremonies of the Church, but zealously prayed that they might be preserved from the same. Laud, and some of the king's chaplains, heard these discourses, and reported them to the king; but "at this time," says Heylin, "there was no remedy; the Scots were Scots, and were resolved to go on in their own way."

On the day after the punishment of the factious

preachers, the following alterations in the service of the Church were proposed by James:—"I. That the holy Eucharist should be reverently received kneeling. II. That it should be administered in private, and in extreme sickness. III. That baptism should be administered in private, if necessary. IV. That episcopal confirmation should be bestowed on youth. V. That the descent of the Holy Ghost, the birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, should be commemorated, on the appointed days." In these propositions James observed, that it was the prerogative of a *Christian* king to regulate the external polity of the Church; nor would he disregard their disapprobation of these articles, unless their arguments admitted of no reply. The assembled preachers said nothing, but fell upon their knees before him, and requested a General Assembly, that these articles might be discussed [1].

We are told that Laud was not content with these articles, but pressed the king to bring the Scottish Church to a nearer conformity with that of England [2]. This was hardly prudent at the present juncture, because the Genevan adherents were numerous and popular. Nevertheless, it might appear to him, that were the king to tamper with the enthusiasm of the populace, additional strength might be imparted to the opposition. Decisive measures were perhaps as expedient as the reverse; for the king had found that the Scots, like the

[1] Spottiswoode, p. 534. [2] Heylin, p. 72, 73.

English Puritans, were not to be gained by lenity or moderation; and if one request was granted them, they would soon make it a precedent for others. They had advanced no arguments in defence, but what had been refuted; and as they made conscience the excuse for their extravagant conduct in religion, so the same pretence might be assigned for their political acts, since they had the address invariably to blend religion and politics together. And it appears, after all, that had the king exercised coercion at this juncture; had he established the Episcopal Church in Scotland on its rightful basis at once, before the malecontents acquired strength and influence to rally their adherents; and had he assigned to that Church a jurisdiction and a power ample and complete, much of the fanaticism of the nation would have been restrained, and the people, by the diligence of their pastors, would have forgotten or disregarded the pretended infallibility of the notions of Calvin.

James, advised by Laud and the clergy who were with him, granted the preachers an Assembly, after having held an interview with the prelates. But he took a politic course to ensure compliance with his wishes. Instead of arguing and disputing, which the king saw was useless, he withheld from the preachers the salaries which had been paid out of his Exchequer; and this had no inconsiderable effect. He then took his departure from Scotland, in which, contrary to his expectations, his authority had as yet been treated with decided opposition and contempt.

After his departure the Assembly met at St. Andrew's, but nothing was decided; and the king was highly incensed at the conduct of the bishops, when the account was transmitted to him. They had demanded from the faction that nothing should be determined until another assembly; and in the mean time Archbishop Spottiswoode, who had incurred James' displeasure, was most indefatigable in his exertions for the Church. The next Assembly, known by the name of the Perth Assembly, was held at Perth on the 26th of August, 1618, when the famous "Five Articles" were finally confirmed. It was attended by commissioners from the king, almost all the nobility and gentry, all the bishops, (except the Bishop of Argyle), and the ministers who were elected by the Presbyterians. Archbishop Spottiswoode opened the court with an admirable sermon, in which he defended, with great ability, the discipline and ritual of the Church. He then proceeded to the moderator's chair, and when an objection was urged to his right, the primate stoutly replied, that the Assembly was held within his diocese, and while he lived no one should occupy his place. The Dean of Winchester then presented a letter from the king, and, after some little discussion, the five Articles were ratified, when put to the vote, by a large majority [1], and henceforward

[1] Pamphlets, published 1619. Calderwood's MSS. vol. vi. p. 407. 422—424. Spottiswoode, p. 534, 535, &c. Calderwood's Hist. p. 691, 692. Life of Spottiswoode, apud Wodrow MSS. p. 62—73. Lord Hailes' Memorials, p. 94—104.

were to be adopted into the ritual of the Scottish Church.

Such was the result of an Assembly, memorable as the last in James' reign, in which an act was passed for the admission of Articles which the king had been negotiating for two years, and which, perhaps, would not have been assented to by many of the Calvinists, had not the king withheld the payment of their stipends. It is doubtless true, that the Presbyterians afterwards denied the validity of its proceedings, and their adherents have laboured to prove that it was informal; but it appears, notwithstanding, that the Assembly was lawfully convened, and was composed of the representatives of the nation[1]. The Articles were rigidly enforced, but without effect. On Christmas day, divine worship was disregarded; and rather than receive the Eucharist kneeling, the zealots either refrained from it altogether, or associated with the rabble. They followed their daily avocations on the days enjoined by the Church for public worship; and in Edinburgh, it is hinted by Spottiswoode, the magistrates secretly encouraged the populace in their opposition[2]. The rebellious ministers were of course deprived, some were punished by imprisonment, others by fines, for inflaming their adherents. Let us hear what a Scottish historian remarks on this subject. "The ceremonies were imposed," says Laing, "by

[1] Vindication by Lindsay, apud Lord Hailes, vol. i. p. 89. Spottiswoode, p. 540.

the prelates as things in themselves indifferent, in which obedience is due to the supreme power; without recollecting, that whatever is indifferent in religion, should belong to the votary's discretion or choice. A nation whose prayers to the Deity are uttered on foot, in an erect posture, was not disposed to obey the requisition of the sovereign, and to bend the knee to the sacramental symbols[1]." But such opinions are founded on fallacious principles, which would lead to tumult and confusion; they contain an apology for that irreverence and rashness in the presence of the Deity, which too much prevails among the sectarians of every description, by which the sacred duty of prayer is often profaned, or its language is used as a vehicle for the expression of private prejudice, and as a vindication of that seeming carelessness and recklessness in Presbyterian congregations, on the pernicious effects of which it is needless to expatiate.

Thus ended, for the remainder of James' reign, all attempts to carry into effect the scheme for uniting the English and Scottish Churches; a scheme judicious in itself, and worthy of James' characteristic wisdom, but which the fanaticism of the original Scottish reformers first rendered abortive, and which the Calvinism of Geneva, with the Puritanism in England, and the unhappy primacy of Abbot, finally made hopeless, by a bold and daring opposition. It was left to James' successor to continue

[1] Laing's History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 79, 80. Lond. 1800.

his father's design, but with worse success; and it was reserved for Laud to take a more active part in the business at a subsequent period. James returned to England, discontented with his journey. He proceeded through Lancashire, and, while in that county, Laud obtained his permission to visit Oxford, and was inducted into the rectory of Ibstock, in Leicestershire, in the gift of the Bishop of Rochester, which he had exchanged for Norton. At Oxford he was received by his friends with the greatest affection, after his long absence; and here he received the pleasing information, that by his exertions he had restrained the Puritan enthusiasm at Gloucester, and that the service of the Church was performed with devotion and solemnity. Nor had any thing remarkable happened during his absence, except some domestic afflictions to Archbishop Abbot. This year died his brother, Dr. Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury, who, we are informed by Heylin, having married when near sixty years of age, incurred the resentment of his brother to such a degree, that it affected him "even unto death."

CHAPTER VI.

1619—1622.

Political errors of James—Clamours against Laud—His promotion—Made prebend of Westminster—Selfish conduct of Bishop Williams—Promotion of Laud to the See of St. David's—Fruitless opposition of Archbishop Abbot—Aspect of the times—Archbishop Abbot's misfortunes—He kills a gamekeeper by accident—History of the affair—He is pardoned by the King—Consecration of the new Bishops—Their unfounded scruples—Diligence of Laud—His primary Visitation—Advantages of it—His return to London—The Parliament—Distressing situation of the King—Vindication of James—The Parliament is dissolved—Intrigues of the Puritans—Calvinism—Remarks on Predestination—Its effects—Instructions of the King to the Clergy—Critical situation of the Church of England—Intrigues of the Papists—The famous Conference between Laud and Fisher the Jesuit—Extracts from the Relation of it—His sentiments on error.

Of the many historical transactions which took place at this period, I shall at present notice only the most important: these were, the death of Henry Prince of Wales, the meeting of the famous Synod of Dort, in which James, by countenancing its proceedings, committed the most unfortunate error into which he was betrayed during the whole course of his reign, and the death of the Queen, Archbishop Abbot's chief supporter,—an intriguing and artful princess, who had but little regard for

the honour and dignity of her husband, or for the welfare of his subjects. The king's greatest misfortune, I have said, was his ratifying the Synod of Dort; and bitterly did his family feel it in an after period. Nor would he, indeed, have countenanced that Synod, so replete in its effects with disasters to himself and to the Church of England, had he not been stimulated by political motives, that he might support the party of the Prince of Orange, and further the interests of the Elector Palatine, who had married his daughter, the Princess Elizabeth.

Laud had now surmounted the various persecutions he had encountered; yet his enemies resolved still to oppose him, on every favourable opportunity. In proportion as he rose in the King's favour, Archbishop Abbot declined; for James saw the malevolence of those who had studiously endeavoured to ruin the reputation of a man so resolute in his defence of the Church against the innovations of the sectarian members. Yet one of Laud's actions had given them occasion to renew their scandal: he had placed an organ in St. John's Chapel, and this was held by his fanatical enemies to be a decisive proof of his popish inclinations. The Presbyterians, who looked with contempt on every harmless decoration, delighted in the nearest approximation possible to rudeness in the churches, and preached a crusade against every thing which tended to promote devotional feeling, apart from their own absurd and clownish taste. And yet it

is not the less remarkable, that the admirers of those very men, whose bigotry and insolence were intolerable, have either adopted an instrument which their ancestors condemned, or others much less harmonious and impressive, or, as in the north, where the cry of Popery would at once be raised by the zealots of Presbytery, they have become disgusted in many places at the nasal drawlings of their clerks, termed precentors, and have now a hired band of vocalists, who warble forth such mercenary strains as are to be heard in many of the English conventicles. But when the remnants of fanaticism have been obliterated, men will learn to think and judge with reason, nor will they deny to the temples of the Almighty those decorations which are fitted to quicken and nourish that inward reverence and devotion which are due to sovereign Majesty and Power.

On the 20th of January, 1620, Laud was installed Prebendary of Westminster, to which dignity he had been advanced ten years before by his friend Bishop Neile. It had been generally reported at Court, that he was to get the Deanery of that Church [1], but Dr. Williams, the Dean, having been presented to the Bishopric of Lincoln, wished rather to keep it in his own hands. The King, Laud says himself, used to observe to him, when commending him for his long services to the crown,

[1] Diary, p. 4. Prynne's Breviat, p. 3. Heylin, p. 80. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii.

that he had given him nothing but the Deanery of Gloucester, "a shell without a kernel[1]." From this it appears that the King thought his merits and services had not been sufficiently rewarded.

That Laud would have preferred the Deanery of Westminster to the Bishopric of St. David's, to which he was about to be promoted as a compensation, there can be no question; for, though he does not expressly say so, yet his eliptical notation of the circumstance evinces that he was disappointed. Perhaps he felt, too, that the conduct of Bishop Williams was not in accordance with his former professions of friendship; and he could not be indifferent to the extraordinary self-interest of that prelate, who, in addition to the See of Lincoln, had been appointed Keeper of the Great Seal of England, in the room of the famous Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, and Lord High Chancellor, who had been banished from Court in disgrace. "Williams so prevailed at Court," says Heylin, "that when he was made Bishop of Lincoln, he retained his Deanery *in commendam*, together with such other preferments as he held at the time, that is to say, a prebend and residentiary place in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, and the Rectory of Walgrave, Northamptonshire, so that he was a perfect Diocese within himself (in his own person,) as being Bishop, Dean, Prebend, Residentiary, and

[1] Diary, ut sup. Bishop Williams, says Wood, shewed himself more a politician than a friend.

Parson, and all these at once." This is no favourable specimen of Bishop Williams. The Bishopric of St. David's being then vacant by the promotion of Dr. Milbourne to the See of Carlisle, and Williams, seeing the king's disposition towards Laud, being aware, that if he was not promoted to that vacant See, he would most certainly receive Westminster, employed his interest with the king, and with the celebrated Buckingham, the court favourite, James, it is said, being at first unwilling to raise him to the Episcopate at once. Laud was nominated to the Bishopric of St. David's. The insinuation, however, that the King was averse to his promotion, is undoubtedly gratuitous, and rests solely on the authority of his enemies; for he expressly informs us, that he got permission from the King, so great was his favour towards him, to hold not only his Prebend in Westminster, but also the Presidentship of St. John's College, *in commendam*, with the Bishopric of St. David's. Bishop Williams, however selfishly he acted on this occasion, still remained Laud's friend, for we find him about a year afterwards assigning to Laud a benefice of 120*l.* per annum in the Diocese of St. David's, to increase the revenues arising from the bishopric[1].

[1] Philips' Life of Archbishop Williams, p. 78. That the King's disposition was favourable towards him, appears from his Diary, p. 4, where he records the facts. The enemies of Laud, however, have been busy here in their mal-representations. Coke, in his Detection, vol. i. p. 144, 145 (edit. 1719.), and Bishop Hacket, in his Life of Archbishop Williams (p. 63,

Those transactions were not observed without concern by Archbishop Abbot, who, beholding the elevation of a man whom he hated, endeavoured to oppose it as much as possible. His motives for doing so were two-fold—the former hostility which subsisted between them, and their difference of

64.) assert, that the King was utterly averse, "assigning for reasons, Laud's marriage of the Lady Rich, and his urging the King not to rest at the Five Articles of Perth," &c. But the Duke of Buckingham, and especially Lord Keeper Williams, earnestly importuned King James, and saying, how sorry Laud was for them, the King at last said, "And is there no hoe but you will carry it! then take him to you, but on my soul you will repent it: and so went away in anger, using other fierce ominous words." This story is ridiculous and improbable, especially concerning the Five Articles of Perth, the urging of which would have been rather a recommendation to James. It is asserted by some writers, that he owed his advancement solely to Bishop Williams, (Hacket, ut sup. p. 64—66. 85, 86. 115, &c. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 61. Oldmixon's History of the Stuarts, vol. i. p. 57.) by which they endeavour to substantiate Laud's criminality in his subsequent conduct to the Bishop, and to prove his ingratitude: but every one who candidly examines this part of Laud's life will admit, that Williams interested himself in Laud not so much out of kindness as to answer his own purposes. (Wood, Athen. Oxon. ut sup.) Bishop Hacket's aspersions on Laud bear in the very language the hostile spirit of party, and a resolution to traduce the memory of one man at the expense of another. Wharton's Preface to Laud's Diary, &c. p. 5, 6. That they both fell into dispute afterwards is too true, nor can the whole conduct of Laud be entirely justified, but we shall afterwards see Archbishop Williams acting in no very favourable manner towards his enemy, taking advantage of his misfortunes, and pursuing him with the most inveterate hostility.

opinion[1]. It was in vain that he lodged representations about Laud's fiery spirit, and his Popish inclinations; Calvinism was now on the decline, the Archbishop's Puritan inclinations were observed by the King, who saw, with regret, the consequences which were daily arising from his patronage of the Calvinists; and the Primate's friends at court now turned a deaf ear to all his insinuations. Perhaps, indeed, his opposition was of service to Laud; for James was the more disposed to promote a man who had the courage to oppose and restrain the Calvinistic extravagances, as daily exhibited by the Puritans, whose opinions, as South well remarks, James hated heartily, because he understood them thoroughly. One writer remarks of Laud, "He was too full of fire, though a just and good man; and his want of experience in state matters, and his too much zeal for the Church, and heat, if he proceeded in the way he was then in, would set this nation on fire[2]." But Laud saw well the consequences of Abbot's government, and he was convinced that decisive measures could alone counteract the impending fate of the Church. His prognostications were unhappily too well founded. During Abbot's unhappy primacy, Calvinism was permitted to take its natural course, fostered and countenanced by him, and "schism and rebellion, its twin offspring, went hand in hand," and were destined, in the next reign,

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 61, 62.
[2] Whitelock's Memorials, p. 34.

to break out with uncontrolable violence, and overturn the constitution, making a melancholy ruin of Church and State. Had the Church been rightly governed after the death of Bancroft, had a successor worthy of that primate been appointed, no opposing power could have effected its overthrow, and it would have stood secure against every adversary. But the fall of the Church was that of the State; and the factious enthusiasts well knew, that their ambition would not be gratified until that achievement was accomplished. Such will again be the case, if ever rebellion be permitted to make silent inroads in our land. The Church will first be attacked, and if it falls, the State will share in its ruin. The fact is clear from former experience: the Church of England, in those perilous times, was overthrown not by the Nonconformists who were kept out, for they were well-known, and even honourable enemies, inasmuch as they did not disguise their hostility, but by the Calvinists whom Abbot admitted within its pale. It had resources within itself, sufficient to withstand all its enemies. It was betrayed in the house of its pretended friends[1].

But while Abbot beheld with regret a man whom, because he was not a Calvinist, he heartily hated, and while he was fruitlessly exerting himself, and pertinaciously adhering in his opposition, an unhappy circumstance occurred to himself, shortly

[1] Quarterly Review, No. LXXIII.

after Laud's nomination to St. David's, which, while it delayed his consecration, was of no small importance. Towards the end of 1619, the Elector Palatine, James' son-in-law, had involved himself in misfortune, by rashly accepting the crown of Bohemia, calculating that the British monarch would assist him in his affairs[1]. Great disputes, consequently, arose in the English Council; some members insisting that James ought not to interfere, while others, and all those who favoured the Calvinistic faction, asserted that James ought to espouse the cause of his son-in-law, from natural affection, and a regard to the Protestant interest. The first opinion, which was held by all those who loved their country, and who, rising superior to the whining enthusiasm of the day, saw that James' interference would excite a war in Germany, was strenuously opposed by the admirers of Calvinism, on whose minds the words *Protestant interest* operated like some hidden charm. Abbot, of course, agreed with the latter, and bethought himself of addressing a letter to the Secretary of State on the subject. The following year was spent in debates and fruitless negotiations, in which James took great interest[2]. In the mean time, the primate's ill health made him less active in this political transaction, and having been long on terms of friendship with Lord Zouch, that nobleman invited him to his seat at Bramshall, in Berkshire, to enjoy

[1] Sanderson's King James, p. 482. [2] Ibid. p. 48.

the pleasures of the field, and to invigorate his body. The primate accepted the invitation, but, while hunting one day in the park, he discharged an arrow at one of the deer, which, missing its mark, unfortunately struck one of Lord Zouch's game-keepers. The man had been warned more than once to keep out of the way, but whether the Archbishop's hand trembled, or the man disregarded the admonition, is uncertain: he was mortally wounded, and bled to death in the course of an hour. He was concealed about the thicket when he was struck, and nothing could exceed Abbot's distress when the cries of the man reached his ear. The unhappy accident excited in him the deepest despondency, and throughout his whole life he religiously observed the day, on its annual return, as a solemn fast. He retired to Guildford, his native town, and there resigned himself to grief, abiding with patience the issue of the great calamity which had befallen him[1].

At this very time four bishops were to be consecrated, Dr. John Davenant, to the See of Salisbury; Dr. John Williams, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, to that of Lincoln; Dr. Valentine Casey, to

[1] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 87. Heylin, p. 80. Baker's Chronicle, 1674, p. 521. Hacket's Life of Williams, p. 65. Le Neve's Protestant Archbishops, p. 65. Sanderson, p. 531. Reliquiæ Spelmanniæ, p. 122, 123. Laud's Diary, p. 4. Prynne's Breviat, p. 2. Neal, vol. ii. p. 138. Collier, vol. ii. p. 720.

the See of Exeter, and Dr. Laud, whom he had so zealously opposed in this promotion to the See of St. David's. Abbot, in consequence of this fatal accident, could not exercise his episcopal functions until cleared of his irregularity; and the bishops-elect, with the exception of Dr. Davenant, objected to his consecration until the affair was investigated. In the mean time, Bishop Williams dispatched a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, dated July 27, 1621, informing that nobleman of the affair; and from that letter we may at once perceive that the objections of Laud, Casey, and himself, on the validity of Abbot's consecration, were not without warrant. "His Grace," says Dr. Williams, "upon this accident is, by the common law of England, to forfeit all his estate to his Majesty, and by the canon law, which is in force with us, is irregular, *ipso facto*, and so suspended from all ecclesiastical functions, until he be again restored by his superior, which, I take it, is the King's Majesty, in this rank and order of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.—I wish, with all my heart, his Majesty may be as merciful as ever he was in all his life, but yet I hold it to be my duty to let his Majesty know, by your Lordship, that his Majesty is fallen upon a matter of great advice and deliberation. To add affliction unto the afflicted, (as no doubt he is in mind) is against the King's nature; to leave *virum sanguinum*, or a man of blood, primate and patriarch of all his churches, is a thing that sounds

very harsh in the old Councils and Canons of the Church. The Papists will not fail to descant upon the one and the other [1]."

This unfortunate accident, of course, excited great interest, and there were some about the court who did not fail to take advantage of the primate's situation to his prejudice. Laud, however, conducted himself in a very different manner. Although he was then secure in the royal favour, and although Abbot had opposed him for many years, persecuted him, and had done every thing to wound his reputation, nevertheless he felt too much of the power of religion to take this advantage over his fallen enemy. His scruples about consecration, in common with his brethren, were conscientious; but farther than this he did not interfere. When James heard of Abbot's misfortune, he is said to have observed, that "an angel might have miscarried in this sort [2];" and he wrote a letter to the primate with his own hand, in which he told him, that "he would not add affliction to his sorrow; or take one farthing from his chattels or moveables, which were forfeited by law [3]." But an investigation was necessary; a commission was issued on the 3d of October to Dr. Williams, Lord Keeper, the Bishops of London and Winchester, the Bishops-elect of St. David's and Exeter, Sir Henry Hubbard, Mr. Justice Dodderidge, Sir Henry Martin, and Dr.

[1] Letters, apud Heylin, p. 80, 81. It appears that Williams had an eye to the primacy himself.—Cabala, 4to. 1654. p. 56.

[2] Hacket, p. 65. [3] Ibid. ut. sup.

Steward, to institute an inquiry. On the 10th November they returned their answer, that as to the Primate's irregularity, "no greater part of their members could assent or agree, because the canons and decrees themselves are so general, and so ready to entertain distinctions and glosses, that they could not come to an unanimous decision;" and so far as scandal was concerned, though they admitted that it might give offence to the weak-minded and malicious, both at home and abroad, most of them believed, that "there was no scandal given by the right reverend father;" and they were finally of opinion, that "it is most fitting for the said reverend father, both in regard of his person, and the honour of the Church, to sue unto his most gracious Majesty for a dispensation *in majorem cautelam, si qua fortè fit irregulariter*[1]."

A pardon was accordingly issued to the Archbishop under the Great Seal, declaring him free of all irregularity and defamation, and capable of exercising his ecclesiastical authority, as if the accident had not occurred. Thus ended this melancholy affair, about which much was said and written on both sides[2]; and on which, it must be confessed, the remarks of Collier on the power which the King assumed are not without foundation[3]. Abbot does

[1] Sanderson's Contin. of Rymer's Foedera, vol. xvii. p. 337—340. Reliquiae Spelmanuiae, p. 107, &c.

[2] Collier, vol. ii. p. 722, 723.

[3] Collier, ut sup. p. 722, 723, 724.

not seem to have lost the favour of James by it, nor was his courage at all subdued; for we find him, in the next year, vigorously opposing the intended alliance between one of the Spanish princesses and Charles, Prince of Wales, although he knew well the King's strong inclination towards the match[1]. He settled 20*l.* a-year upon the widow of the man of whose death he had been the innocent cause, "which," says Fuller, "soon procured her another husband[2]."

Notwithstanding the royal proclamation, however, the scruples of the Bishops-elect were not overcome, and they presented a petition to the King, entreating that his Majesty would select some other prelates to assist at their consecration, as they still felt a reluctance to receive it from the hands of the Archbishop. The King complied with their request, and issued a commission to the Bishops of London, Oxford, Ely, Worcester, and Llandaff, to act in the room of the Primate. Accordingly, Dr. Williams, the Bishop of Lincoln, was consecrated by those prelates on the 11th of November, in Henry VII.'s Chapel; and on the 18th, Doctors Laud, Casey, and Davenant, were consecrated to their respective

[1] Heylin, p. 111. Sanderson, p. 236. 550. Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 85. 88. 101. 438, 439. Frankland's Annals of King James, p. 80. Parliamentary History, vol. vi. p. 91, &c. Sir Arthur Wilson's Court and Character of King James, p. 175.

[2] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 87.

dioceses by the same prelates, in the Bishop of London's chapel. Here another instance of Laud's magnanimity and uprightness must not be forgotten. The day before his consecration, he resigned the Presidentship of St. John's College. "The King gave me leave," says he, "to hold the Presidentship of St. John's College, in Oxon, *in commendam* with the Bishopric of St. David's; but, by reason of the strictness of that statute, which I shall not violate, nor my oath to it, *under any colour*, I am resolved before my consecration to leave it[1]." Now, had Laud been the man his enemies represented him, desirous of power and influence, nothing could have been more easy for him than to have retained his office. He had the King's authority for so doing, and his situation gave him an importance in the University necessary for him to maintain, that he might repress the Calvinistic extravagances; and his bishopric was not so wealthy but that he might have retained it with justice, without the charge of avarice. Yet nothing could induce him to violate an oath, to act against the dictates of his conscience, or to sacrifice his religion to the advancement of his worldly importance[2]. Was such a man deserving

[1] Prynne, in his Breviat, p. 2, maliciously omits the last clauses.

[2] Dr. Heylin, p. 82, has here fallen into an error. He says, that Laud held the Presidentship and the Bishopric, and later writers have followed this authority. Of course, Heylin's error can be easily accounted for. Prynne ransacked Laud's papers, and concealed the originals, whence he inserted what he pleased.

of the foul reproaches of his enemies, who, besides branding him with every thing which their ingenuity and craftiness could devise, as hostile to the reformed religion, alleged that he was a mere worldly priest, and, as the fanatical Prynne, clamoured about his great preferments; whereas he resigned many of the minor benefices he possessed before his elevation to the Episcopate?

It is not necessary to enlarge on the conduct of Laud and the other prelates, in objecting to Abbot's consecration. When we reflect on Abbot's circumstances, we must concede, that their scruples, though sincere, were utterly groundless; for they themselves had admitted, that, after the King's pardon, he could lawfully exercise his metropolitan functions. No man can be deposed from the ministry of the Church unless he commits crimes against the state, or preaches doctrines in direct opposition to the holy Scriptures. Now, Abbot had committed no crime, he was unconscious of his misfortune at the time, and therefore his consecration could not be irregular, even although he had not received the King's pardon; for by that act the King did certainly assume to himself a power, which virtually he did not possess; whereas the course which ought to have been adopted was a regular trial or investigation by judges, who themselves would have pro-

Heylin's work was published in 1671, and he was compelled to use Prynne's mutilated edition of the Diary, published in 1644. The authentic copy was published in 1695. Wharton's Preface, p. 1, 2. and Diary, p. 4.

nounced on the case. But it must not be forgotten, that though the bishops did perhaps entertain their scruples without foundation, their conduct is highly meritorious, because those scruples were conscientious, and not resulting from any private dislike towards the primate, while, as dignitaries of the Church, and having its honour and advancement at heart, they could not but deplore his unhappy government. They made Abbot amenable to the civil power, and from that source he was exculpated. But their enemies, the Papists, conduct their proceedings very differently in such cases: they make their ecclesiastics subject to no civil power, and this abominable error is at once destructive of the constitution of government. For if a priest, whether he be guilty or not, is to be tried by men who declare that they are independent in themselves, what security is there against tyranny and intolerance? The history of the Romish Church abundantly exemplifies this remark. All men, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are members of the state; therefore, they must be subject to its laws, and under the control of the King, who, as the guardian of all his subjects, is temporal head of the Church, as he is the head of the State. But the politics of Popery require no comment; and it rests with the unprejudiced mind to judge what anarchy would be introduced were these politics again to prevail.

At this time, and previously, we find Laud industriously employed in preaching on many occasions, which he has recorded in his Diary. The

first of his printed sermons, remarkable for its reasoning, was preached before the King at Wanstead, on the 19th of June, 1620. On the 24th of March, 1621, we find him again preaching at Court, and this sermon was commanded to be published. It is the second of his published discourses.

Laud, immediately after his consecration, being installed into his diocese by proxy, took his seat in the Parliament, which was sitting at the time. The public business of the two Houses, however, was not of great consequence, yet in this Parliament we cannot fail to observe the symptoms of that intolerance by which they afterwards arrogated to themselves the exclusive right to legislate for the nation. The intended marriage between the Prince of Wales and the Infanta of Spain was then discussed, which, though it was never destined to be accomplished, it being defeated in another quarter, engrossed the attention of the King, who was greatly inclined to the alliance from political motives. The King demanded fresh supplies from the Commons, but the zealots among them had adopted their resolution. Forgetting that the queen, whoever she might be, was only an individual in the nation, and subject to its laws, they transmitted successive addresses to the King, in which they expressed their alarm at the growth of Popery, and the danger of an alliance with a Roman Catholic Princess. At that crisis, perhaps, those representations were not without foundation, nevertheless, they acted most unconstitutionally in ad-

vising the King rather to make war against Spain than to sanction such an alliance. The influence of Calvinism among the members had made such as were puritanically inclined so fanatical, as to propose that no connexion—not even those relating to the rights and laws of nations, should be formed with any princes, save Protestants,—a proposition as absurd as it was ridiculous and extravagant. James saw a faction growing in strength, already arrayed against him; and no monarch, perhaps, was more disagreeably situated. His natural love of peace made him at all times decisive on that subject—a policy which he doubtless carried to excess, inasmuch as the glory of Britain was almost forgotten by the continental princes. But he was never in a condition to engage in war; his treasury was poor, his resources circumscribed, and, above all, a virulent faction against him; it became him, therefore, as a prudent monarch, to guard against the fanaticism of the times. With his subjects disunited, and many of them under the influence of wild enthusiasm, it was impossible for James not to reflect without serious apprehensions on the consequences of war. Moreover, the disputes on the continent had rendered many of the states a scene of anarchy and strife. His son-in-law, the Elector, had rashly involved himself in ruin; and James could afford him no pecuniary assistance: it was state policy, therefore, when he beheld a portentous storm gathering on the continent, to form an alliance, which, without sacrificing the honour of

the kingdom, would avert the danger which threatened the speedy destruction of his children. But James unfortunately could not calculate on the affections of his people; nor yet could his predecessor Elizabeth, notwithstanding her popularity and vigorous administration; and hence arose the necessity for adopting those measures which are pretended to be arbitrary and tyrannical by some of the sagacious statesmen of modern times, who invariably reason from their own consciousness, and will not make allowances for the age, and for the intrigues of Papists and Puritans, against whom those sovereigns had to contend. England at this time was dissatisfied: the Calvinists had disseminated their tenets among the people, and had inflamed their zeal by their own extravagant example: Scotland, a country in which faction had predominated for a century, was now in a state of turbulence by the exertions of the Presbyterian leaders: and but little assistance could be derived from Ireland, a country whose inhabitants, being principally Papists, and bigotted to a proverb, required to be kept in subjection by the strong arm of power, more especially as Tyrconnel's rebellion had not been long restrained, and as the Papists were as intolerably factious, from the very nature of their religion, as their brethren of the opposite extreme in England. Let us only look, then, at the King's situation. He made no encroachments on the liberties of the Commons; they, in reality, had at that period greater liberties than they had

ever enjoyed during any preceding reign: and their conduct towards the King fully justifies the conclusion, that he yielded too much to their former demands, while they were beginning to forget that there were other two estates in the constitution as essential as their own in the act of legislating for the nation. With a people whom he could not trust, and a Parliament arrogating to itself the power of an independent state in the very heart of the monarchy, no resource was left for James but to exercise his prerogative, which he did, by adjourning the Parliament, on the 19th of December, and then by dissolving it on the 8th of January.

Not one of the many opinions formed concerning this procedure at the time seems to approach the truth; for James acted neither from natural timidity, poverty, nor hatred to parliamentary business, but from the clear discernment which he possessed. He felt his difficulties, but he saw misfortunes; and he therefore adopted the only measure by which he could frustrate the intentions of the parliamentary faction. And though James was wrong in the issue, yet, in the conduct of princes we are not so much to judge of their actions as of their motives; for they can control their motives, but the actions, as effects involved in comparative uncertainty, they cannot. It is the motive or will which criminates a man, whether his carrying it into effect succeeds or not. No one can charge James with a design against the liberties of his country, as if he wished

to overthrow the constitution, ruin the Church, and entrench himself in arbitrary power. He held the reins of government tightly, because it was necessary for him to do so; but, notwithstanding all the aspersions which have been cast upon his memory for his notions of his own prerogative, it remains to be proved that he stretched it beyond its rightful limits. If he was severe in enforcing the discipline of the Church, what else could he do, when he saw it surrounded by men who were fondly anticipating its ruin? Plots in succession had been formed against him, from the daring Gunpowder treason to the minor ones, which his vigilance counteracted. He had been repeatedly excommunicated by the Pope, and the Roman Catholics, of course, were in league with the Pontiff; while the Puritans were no less seditious in their sermons, their pamphlets, and their private exhortations. His hatred to the Papists was not surpassed by his hatred to the Puritans, more particularly as he saw that their claims were not less arrogant, or their conduct less intolerable. The proceedings of this Parliament, in fact, proved the seditious nature of its enthusiasm, and justified the remark which James made on one occasion on the Puritan faction in general. "There never was a faction," said he, "during the times of my minority, nor trouble since, but they that were upon that factious part were ever careful to persuade and allure those unruly spirits among the ministry to espouse their quarrels as their own; whereupon I was often calumniated in their popular sermons,

not for any evil or vice in me, but because I was a King, which they thought the greatest evil."

Such was the nature of this famous Parliament, of which Bishop Laud was a member. It has been said that Laud was no statesman, that he knew nothing of political business, that he had no talents for affairs. But had Laud lived in an age when reason prevailed instead of enthusiasm, and moderation instead of fanatical violence, he would have been as great at the helm of government as he was in the Church, of which he was a distinguished ornament. To adopt the language of a celebrated writer of the present day[1], whose numerous inconsistences, however, will not be forgotten, "there is no middle course in dealing with religious sectaries, between the persecution that exterminates and the toleration that satisfies." To them, as to the Roman Catholics, who are most noted schismatics, nothing can be conceded which will satisfy their demands; the more concessions they receive, the greater ingenuity they exercise in inventing fresh claims. But short as the sitting of this Parliament was, and it only sat one month, Laud saw enough to convince him of the intentions of those who traduced and injured their sovereign. Popery and Puritanism were the two extremes between which the Church of England was situated, both openly opposed to it, but the danger, as the event proved, was not so threatening from the former,

[1] Mr. Hallam, in his Constitutional History of England.

as the latter. Forgetting esssential doctrines in religion, the Puritans eagerly contended for what they admitted were in themselves of little consequence. "The Puritans," says Heylin, whom I quote at length, as the remarks are indisputable, "seeing they had no more prevailed against the Church by their open batteries, than the Roman Emperors had done against the primitive Church by their persecutions, resolved upon more secret and consequently more dangerous practices, to attain their ends. In order whereunto, they had perpetually alarmed the King, from his first coming to the crown, with continual dangers from the Papists, for which the Gunpowder treason gave them too much reason. Nor would they suffer any session of Parliament to pass, from that time forward, in which the dangerous practices of priests, Jesuits, &c. did not sound in his ears. And this they did, not so much because they saw any such visible growth of Popery as was by them pretended from time to time, but that they thought it the best way to carry on the other projects which they had in hand. For well they knew that when the thoughts both of King and people were totally engrossed by the dangers which were feared from the Papists, the Puritan party, in the mean time, might gather strength, without being noted or observed."

After the dissolution of Parliament, Laud proceeded to his diocese, to make a pastoral inspection of its affairs: and, in the mean time, as a farther increase to his revenues, the King gave him, *in*

commendam, the Rectory of Creeke, in Northamptonshire[1]. In his primary visitation he manifested his accustomed care for the Church, by taking cognizance of the parishes in that extensive diocese, repairing the churches, and generously appropriating his revenues towards the laudable purpose of rendering them commodious and comfortable for the celebration of divine service. His own chapel he built and fitted in a manner suitable to his condition, solemnly consecrating it himself for the worship of God, according to the Form of the venerable and learned Bishop Andrews, which act was afterwards recorded by his enemies, as an additional proof of the charges they brought against him[2]; so natural is it for fanatics to take advantage of every thing, falsely to condemn what they cannot refute, and reckon the crazy effusions of their brains as absolute truth, while they cannot substantiate a single assertion.

The building and consecrating of this chapel were not completed till some years afterwards; but in the mean time this active prelate, having arranged the affairs of his diocese, returned to London on the 15th of August, 1622, and waited on the King. While Laud was at Court, the Puritans endeavoured to give an indication of their intentions as gently as possible, yet merely by way of trial. A member of Pembroke College, Oxford,

[1] Diary, p. 4. 6. Heylin, p. 96.

[2] Canterburie's Doome, by Prynne, p. 504.

named Knight, in a sermon on Palm Sunday, April 14, 1622, at St. Peter's Church, from Rom. xiii. 1. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," set forth the genuine tenets of Puritanism, that the inferior magistrate has power to order and correct the king, if he acts in error; in other words, that subjects may rise in rebellion when they think themselves aggrieved. This dogma, maintained by Calvin, who often from the pulpit threatened the magistrates of Geneva with an insurrection, if they did not yield to his desires, and vigorously set forth by Knox and others in Scotland, this *protegé* of the faction divided into four heads, in which he justified resistance:—1. When the chief magistrate turns tyrant: 2. When he forces blasphemy or idolatry upon his subjects. 3. When intolerable burdens are laid upon them. And, 4. When resistance is the only expedient to save themselves, and to obtain their objects. These dangerous and seditious opinions, true only in particular cases, and under great restrictions, the genuine essence of enthusiasm, were more especially calculated to inflame the nation at this time; for though none of them could be charged on the King, nevertheless they would be received with exultation by the Puritans, and turned to their own advantage. Knight was called to account for his opinions by the Vice-chancellor of the University, and compelled to deliver a copy of the sermon. Laud was then with the King, and, at the command of James, the preacher was cited to court, and the sermon was

also transmitted. Knight confessed that he had taken his illustrations from the work of a foreign Calvinist[1], and that he had advanced them without calculating the consequences; but he protested that, with regard to himself, he had preached the sermon without any political motive, and that he was heartily sorry for what he had done. His apology was received by the King, who saw that the tenets were not so much his own as the tenets of those around him; and, perceiving in him indications of genius, dismissed him with a salutary admonition. The Puritans, however, speculated so much on the affair, that it was found necessary to take further steps. The book of Pareus was publicly burnt at Oxford, Cambridge, and at St. Paul's Cross, London, by the common executioner; its dogmas were declared seditious and treasonable; and, to put a stop at once to the fanaticism of the Puritans in the University, an oath was framed, which every one was called to subscribe, declaring that he renounced and disbelieved the dangerous principles of that book,—that they were utterly subversive of the Church and State,—and that he would oppose them to the utmost of his ability during his life[2].

[1] A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, by Pareus, a minister of Heidelburgh.

[2] "Was there ever," exclaim Messrs. Bogue and Bennett, "so unreasonable and so absurd an oath devised? It seems to have been the determined resolution of Archbishop Bancroft to crush at once the religion of the Puritans and the liberties of the nation." A few remarks may be offered to these worthy secta-

But it was found necessary to take other measures. Hitherto I have abstained from making any

rian writers, or at least, to their enthusiastic admirers. As to their question, it would require little research into history to answer it, but as it is impossible to digress continually to expose the falsehoods and sophistry of Neal, Messrs. Bogue and Bennett, and *their* great authority, Warner, I must refrain. Yet I could prove to them, that the Puritans violated the most solemn oaths, that they persuaded others to do so, and, moreover, that their seditious sermons and pamphlets rendered oaths more "unreasonable and absurd" than the above absolutely necessary. Let the following effusion from a Puritan pamphlet suffice. "As to you, dear brethren, whom God hath called into the brunt of the battle, the Lord keep you constant, *that ye yield neither to toleration*, neither to any subtle persuasions of dispensations and licences, which are to fortify these Romish practices, but, as ye fight the Lord's fight, be valiant." These writers, moreover, have charged Bancroft with this oath; by which they display their utter ignorance of history. If they require to be told it, Bancroft, whom they so much vilify, died in 1610, and this affair took place in 1622, and under the primacy of their favourite, Abbot. It is deplorable to see men writing about facts which they have never investigated, and setting down any thing to serve their own purposes. But if they must have the truth, Bancroft *did attempt* "to crush the religion of the Puritans," but it by no means follows that Puritanism and British liberty are one and the same. He nobly wished to check the extravagant fanaticism of those Calvinistic malcontents, and Bancroft was gifted with more penetration than Messrs. Bogue and Bennett. The religion of the Puritans! what was it? Rhodomontade, enthusiasm, eternal quibblings on trifles, hatred to the King and government, gloomy Calvinism, zeal for Geneva, intolerance, and obstinacy; in short, it was such as the present age, it is admitted even by Dissenters, would not endure. And as to their religion being identified with the "liberties of the nation,"

observations on the sermons of the Puritans, nor do I now intend to enlarge on this copious subject; yet I may remark, that they partook, of course, of the known extravagance of their authors. The havoc which their opinions were making among the younger students and the people was notorious; some of the former had turned Papists, some had become infected with the heresy of the Anabaptists, some had turned Brownists or Independents, and all of them incessantly intermeddled with affairs of state, and passed their seditious verdicts of censure with the most undisguised assurance; while the people were imbibing with avidity the fanaticism which they heard inculcated. But the doctrines of Calvin were chiefly in the mouths of the preachers; the abstruse, and fanciful, and daring dogmas of predestination, election, reprobation, irresistibility of grace, and final perseverance, themes which ought never to be introduced into popular sermons even by a supporter of them, as being by far too *profound* for the capacities of a popular (or indeed any) audience, in which the great majority are illiterate, and which, besides their contradiction to the Scriptures, have the most dangerous effect upon the mind. For where is he who can prove what he calls the divine decree? Most daring indeed is that man who pretends to scan the ways of Omnipotence, and to set

who requires to be told of the state to which their cunning intrigues reduced this kingdom when they obtained the mastery, of the blood which they shed, the murders they committed, under the sacred names of religion and liberty?

limits to divine grace; who forgets that "secret things belong to the Lord our God alone," and who pretends that he, a short-sighted, frail, and erring mortal, has discovered the will of Heaven; that infants and full-grown men, ages before they are born, were doomed to eternal punishment for Adam's transgression, by a divine decree, which they could not alter. Most impious is he who thus sets limits to the mercy of Heaven, and makes the God of love appear as an implacable tyrant; mocking the creatures he has made, offering them salvation, punishing them if they do not accept of it, and yet who has decreed from all eternity, that salvation shall not be theirs. Most guilty is he who thus contracts the efficacy of Christ's redemption, and asserts, that the death of our divine Saviour is not the ground of hope to every son and daughter of Adam's degenerate offspring, who sincerely repents and unfeignedly believes God's holy gospel. Need I stop to reflect on the tendency which such preaching must have had on the minds of the people in that fierce age of religious contention? or need I enter into any metaphysical argument to shew how destructive these tenets are to the spread of pure and undefiled religion, and to the peace and well-being of civil government? The history of that age furnishes too many melancholy illustrations. Let the reader only turn to the daring actions of the English Puritans under Charles I. which they planned during his father's life-time; let him look to the reign of fanaticism under Cromwell, that patron of sectaries; let

him turn to the achievements of the Covenanting religionists of the north, to their rebellions, their enthusiasm, their insolence to their rulers, their canting sermons, their almost impious prayers, and their irreverent "familiaritie" with the Majesty of Heaven. Let the reader ponder well the intolerable arrogance of those religionists, who, like their brethren, the Papists, alleged that they were the only true Church, excommunicated all who differed from them, and swore solemn oaths, that *with the sword,* and without mercy, they would extirpate Popery, Prelacy, Arminianism, Erastianism, &c. as their precious record of treason, entitled the Solemn League and Covenant, sets forth: who invariably spoke with the most intolerable insolence of their rightful governors, and who more than once acted as vile assassins, when it was in their power. And then let the reader trace the history of the Dissenters in the last century, when he will find Socinianism, Arianism, and Infidelity, making dreadful havoc among them. It is at times dangerous and hazardous for one poor sinner to denounce damnation from the pulpit to his hearers, when perhaps he has as much need of repentance as they, and at all times it must be done with solemn caution; but it is doubly presumptuous for erring and frail men to pretend to scan the ways of Heaven, and assert, with the most positive assurance, the dogmas of election and reprobation.

To counteract these principles, so pregnant with disastrous consequences, the king, not unlikely by

the advice of Laud, issued a letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, bearing date the 20th of August, 1622, and by them to be communicated to their suffragans, containing sundry rules, which they were enjoined to put in execution. This letter commences thus: "Most reverend father in God, right trusty and right entirely beloved counsellor, we greet you well. Forasmuch as the abuses and extravagances of preachers in the pulpit have been at all times passed in this realm by some act of council or state, with the advice and resolution of grave and learned prelates, insomuch as the very licensing of preachers had beginning by an order of Star-chamber the 8th day of July, in the 19th year of King Henry VIII. our noble predecessor: and whereas at this present divers young students, by reading of late writers and ungrounded opinions, do broach many times unprofitable, infamous, seditious, and dangerous doctrines, to the scandal of this Church, and disquieting of this state and present government, upon humble representations of this inconveniency to yourself and sundry others, &c. Given at Windsor, 4th Aug. in the 20th year of our reign [1]."

The directions were six in number, and are inserted in various historical works [2]. The nature of them may be easily conceived, yet the moderation

[1] Collection of MSS. vol. i. p. 85. Tho. Cant.

[2] Heylin, p. 93, 94. Neal, vol. ii. p. 137. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 64, 65, 66.

of the language is remarkable. In the third direction it is set forth, "That no preacher of what title soever under the degree of a bishop, or dean at the least, do from henceforth presume to preach in any popular auditory the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility, of God's grace; but rather leave those themes to be handled by learned men, and that modestly and moderately by use and application, rather than by way of positive doctrine, as being fitter for schools and universities than for simple auditories." And the fifth declares, "That no preacher, of what title or denomination soever, shall causelessly, and without any invitation from the text, fall into any bitter invectives and indecent railings against the Papists or Puritans, but wisely and gravely, when they are occasioned thereunto by the text of Scripture, free both the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England from the aspersions of either adversary, especially when the auditory is suspected to be tainted with the one or the other infection."

The directions were of course levelled against the Puritans, and made the faction excessively clamorous[1]. But the activity of the Church succeeded in silencing those malecontents[2], notwithstanding the pains they took to excite the people by visionary fears[3]. And the observation of Fuller is quite suffi-

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 137, 138.

[2] Fuller's Church History, book x. p. 111.

[3] Heylin, p. 94.

cient on the subject, for these directions were highly necessary at a time when "many shallow preachers handled the profound points of predestination, wherein, pretending to guide their flocks, they lost themselves [1]."

The situation of the Church at this period was truly hazardous. Attacked on the one hand by the Papists, and on the other by the Puritans, it required the greatest skill in those who regarded the interests of the Reformation, and the welfare of Church and State, to restrain the hostile intentions of those factions. No sooner had the Parliament been dissolved, than the Papists began to exert themselves with the greatest activity. The Puritans were chiefly popular among the lower classes, who were sufficiently illiterate, and were generally treated with contempt by the higher orders of the kingdom. The Papists, however, who could also reckon a considerable number of adherents among the rabble, were more ambitious, and endeavoured to secure adherents among the nobility. For this purpose they laid a most crafty plot, and began first to practise on the Duchess of Buckingham, the lady of the celebrated court favourite; not doubting, that if they were successful in inducing her to recant, they might have some chance of favour for their tenets from her husband. The famous John Fisher, the Jesuit, had undertaken the task of ma-

[1] Fuller, ut sup. p. 108.

naging the lady, and he had succeeded so well, that she was beginning to think favourably of the superstition. But the Jesuit's designs were reported to the king, who was himself not wanting in ability to argue the matter, and who frequently discoursed to her on the subject. James, however, feeling interested in the lady, and resolving to silence the Jesuit at once by fair argument, advised the Duke to appoint a conference between Fisher and a learned divine of the Church, on the errors of the Romish superstition. The Duke agreed, and Dr. Francis White, then Rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, afterwards Bishop of Ely, was appointed to meet the Jesuit[1]. Three disputes were held in the presence of the Duke of Buckingham, his mother, his lady, and the Lord Keeper Williams, on the 24th of May, 1622, the last was conducted by Laud. The result was as might have been expected: Laud

[1] This learned man had acquired no small popularity by his divinity lectures in St. Paul's, of which he was reader, in preaching against the absurdities of Popery: and he was profoundly learned in all points of theological controversy. He was engaged to meet Fisher in the presence of the Duke (then Marquis,) and his mother; but one meeting not being sufficient, another was appointed at which the King himself was present. In the second conference, nothing had been said on the dogma of an infallible church, which, says Heylin, "was the chief and only point in which the party doubting required satisfaction." The King then appointed a third meeting, in which Laud was nominated to oppose Fisher, instead of Dr. White.

was more than a match for the Jesuit in learning, and victory was declared on the side of truth [1].

It is impossible here to give an abstract of Laud's admirable arguments. An account of the conference was published in 1624, and a justification of it published by the Archbishop himself in 1637, in connexion with a pamphlet written by Dr. Francis White, entitled, "A Reply to Jesuit Fisher's Answer to certain Questions propounded by his most gracious Majesty King James." The ingenuity with which Laud detects the Jesuist's sophistry, the profound learning which he displays, and the intimate acquaintance which he appears to have had with the Fathers and Councils of the Church, prove the greatness of his genius, and his devotion to the Reformation. "In this discourse," says he, "I have no aim to displease any, nor any hope to please all. If I can help on the truth in the Church, and the peace of the Church together, I shall be glad, be it in any measure. Nor shall I spare to speak necessary truth, out of too much love of peace; nor thrust an unnecessary truth to the breach of that peace which, once broken, is not so easily renewed again. And if, for necessary truth's sake only, any man will be offended, nay take, nay snatch at, the offence which is not given, for that I know no protection. It is truth, and I must state it; it is the gospel, and I must preach it, 1 Cor. xi. 16. And far safer it is

[1] There is an account of this Jesuit, whose real name was Perse, or Persey, in "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu," Romæ, 1676, p. 487.

in this case to bear anger from men, than a woe from God. And where the foundations of faith are shaken, be it by superstition or profaneness, he that stretches not out his hand as firmly as he can to support them, is too wary, and hath more care of himself than of the cause of Christ: and it is a wariness, that brings more danger in the end than it shuns. For the angel of the Lord issued out a curse against the inhabitants of Meroz, because they came not to help the Lord, to help the Lord against the mighty, Judges, v. 23. I know it is a great ease to let every thing be as it will, and every man believe and do as he lists: but whether governors in State or Church do their duty therewhile is easily seen, since this is an effect of no king in Israel."

Such is the eloquence of this great prelate, who was, when he wrote the above, in the See of Canterbury. This is the man whom his enemies charged as being a Papist, these are the sentiments of him whom sectarians have traduced as being of "infamous memory." But I will proceed to another extract, which I am certain the reader will peruse with interest, while here considering one of the most splendid actions of Laud's life. "Now one thing more," says Laud, "let me be bold to observe to your Majesty in particular, concerning your great charge in the Church of England. She is in hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her for novelty in her doctrine. She practises church government as it hath been in use in all ages, and

all places, where the Church of Christ hath been established both in and since the days of the Apostles, and yet the separatist condemns her for anti-christianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones, and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable, that while both these press hard upon the Church of England, both of them cry out against persecution, like froward children, who scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while, as if they were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this: The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old, and when errors are grown, by age, and continuance, to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be of an older, are usually challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, whether we will or not, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, Where was your Church before Luther? for it was just there, where theirs is now: one and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same

Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us: the same man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separation, or change of discipline; though all he says, or can say, be, in truth of divinity, and among learned men, little better than ridiculous; yet since those fond opinions have gained some ground among the people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing. But for so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, they are bells of passing good metal, and tunable enough of themselves, and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is, that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are by them who have acquired power in and over their consciences. And for this there is remedy enough, but how long there will be I know not."

"The Scripture," continues Laud, in another place, "where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture: yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that, upon just and farther evidence, she may not revive that which in any case hath slept by her. What success the great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion

gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither party consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme, which they both seem to oppose and to fear. The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle; out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it; but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too. Salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this discourse I have, therefore, endeavoured to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church, confined to no age, time, or place, not knowing any bounds, but that faith which was once, and but once for all, delivered to the saints. And in my pursuit of this way, I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof I have obeyed your Majesty, discharged my duty, to my power, to the Church of England, given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God's blessing and favour purpose to die[1]."

[1] A Relation of the Conference between William Laud, then Lord Bishop of St. David's, now Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Fisher the Jesuit, by the command of King James of ever-blessed memorie. With an Answer to such Exceptions as A. C. takes against it. By the said Most Rev. Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, folio. London, 1639. Introductory Dedication to Charles I. The last edition of this admirable work, now almost forgotten, appeared in 1673.

The points which Dr. White discussed with the Jesuit, were the usual differences between the Romish and the Reformed Church. The Jesuit defended, 1. Praying to images. 2. Prayers and oblations to the Blessed Virgin Mary. 3. Worshipping and invocations of Saints and Angels. 4. The Liturgy and private prayers for the ignorant in an unknown tongue. 5. The repetition of paternosters, aves, and credos, especially affixing a kind of merit to the number of them. 6. The doctrine of Transubstantiation. 7. Communion under one kind, and the abetting of it by concomitancy. 8. Works of Supererogation, especially with reference to the treasures of the Church. 9. The opinion of deposing kings, and giving away their kingdoms by papal power, whether directly or indirectly. Dr. White, as a reward for his merit, was made royal chaplain, and Dean of Carlisle. His work displays his erudition. On the above dogmas Laud entered with his usual ability; the Jesuit was defeated, and Laud's enemies were confounded. And yet so modest was the prelate, that, though this is a work which will justly entitle him to the gratitude of posterity, and which, as was declared by his enemies, is unequalled, far less surpassed, he at first prefixed to it the initials R. B. (Dr. Richard Bailey, the name of one of his chaplains, who afterwards married his niece,) and merely published it as an Appendix to Dr. White's work. And though Prynne, who caught at every thing,

thinks proper to tell us, in the Breviate[1], that he delayed the publishing of it so long, for fear of being engaged thereby against his friends the Papists, yet if that enthusiast had read the book, he might have seen that he was asserting a gratuitous falsehood. "The cause," says Laud, "why at the first the discourse upon this conference was delayed so long is this:—It was neither my idleness nor my unwillingness to do justice both to myself and to the cause against the Jesuit, which occasioned this delay, for I had then most honourable witnesses, and have some yet living, that this discourse was finished long before I could persuade myself to let it come into public view. And this was caused partly by the reason that there was about the same time three conferences held with Fisher, of which this was the third: and could not, therefore, conveniently come abroad into the world till the two former were ready to lead the way, which till now they were not. And this is, in part, the reason also why this tract crept in at the end of a larger work; for surely that work contained in a manner the substance of all that passed in the two former conferences, and since this third in divers points concurred with them, and depended on them, I could not think it substantial enough to stand alone. But besides this affinity between the conferences, I was willing to have it pass, as silently as it might, at the end of another work, and so perhaps little to

[1] Prynne's Breviate, p. 13.

be looked after, because I could not hold it worthy (nor can I yet) of that great duty and service which I owe to my dear mother, the Church of England."

Here, it may be remarked, that the wickedness or falsehood of Laud's enemies is more conspicuous, when they accused him, with this celebrated Conference before them, of being a professed Papist. No action of this great man's life was there to encourage such an opinion, and the Papists themselves declared that he was their greatest enemy. But Laud has himself told us, that "a man is apt to think he can never run far enough from that which he once begins to hate: and doth not consider, therewhile, that where religion corrupted is the thing he hates, a fallacy may be easily put upon him, for he ought to hate the corruption which depraves religion, and to run from it; but from no part of religion itself, which he ought to love and reverence, ought he to depart." These remarks are unanswerable, and contain a host of arguments against the Puritans. Yet, after all, we find one of his bitterest enemies, Sir Edward Deering, observing, on a future occasion, "That Laud's Relation of his Conference with the Jesuit would live after he was dead; that by it he had stabbed the Papists under the fifth rib[1]."

[1] Fuller, Church History, book xi.

CHAPTER VII.

1622—1625.

Laud's connexion with the Duke of Buckingham—Notice of that favourite—The Prince of Wales—Intended marriage with the Infanta—His journey to Spain with Buckingham—Their adventures—False assertions of Laud's enemies—Zeal of Archbishop Abbot—Insolence of the Papists—Cunning intrigues of Bishop Williams—Enmity to Laud—Conduct of the Archbishop towards Laud—Instances of Laud's piety—Meeting of the Parliament—Remarkable conduct of Abbot—Opposition of Laud to Buckingham—Moderation of that nobleman—Negotiations with France—Death of James I.—His character—His conduct towards Scotland—The Book of Sports—Defence of James—His character by Archbishop Spottiswoode.

The conduct of Bishop Laud, in his Conference with the Jesuit, was the commencement of an intimate friendship between him and the Marquis (afterwards Duke) of Buckingham[1]. That celebrated favourite, whose life was so brilliant, and whose death was so melancholy, inclined though he was to splendour and gaiety, could nevertheless appreciate the value of a man of learning and genius, whose integrity was conspicuous in all his actions.

[1] Diary, p. 5. "June 9, being Whitsunday, my Lord Marquis of Buckingham was pleased to enter upon a near respect for me. The particulars are not for paper."

The favours which Buckingham had received at Court, his extraordinary advancement and influence, and the ascendancy which he had acquired over the King, are facts indeed remarkable, yet he was no worthless minion, neither was he altogether undeserving of his good fortune; and, though he certainly exalted the members of his own family, and his dependents, yet it was not with a view to establish himself more securely at Court, since he was there supported solely by his own genius[1]. He has been traduced as licentious and profligate by many, and thence have they taken occasion to infer, that while he was the Prince's confidant and companion, Charles' life, like his own, was not the most virtuous[2]: but it must not be forgotten, that

[1] MS. Sir Simon D'Ewes' Account of Himself. Harleian Library.

[2] Historia Vitæ et Regni Ricardi II. ab auct. T. Hearne, p. 404. In this work there is a letter from the Prince to the Duke, from which it appears that he was a confidant in an intrigue of the former. It is to the following effect:—

"Steanie, I have nothing now to wryte to you, but to give you thankes bothe for the good councill ye gave me, and for the event of it. The King gave me a good sharp potion, but you took away the working of it by the well-relished comfites ye sent after it. I have met with the party that must not be named, once alreddie, and the cullor of wrighting this letter shall make me meete with her on Saturday, although it is written the day being Thursday. So assuring you that the business goes safelie now, I rest your constant loving friend, CHARLES.

"I hope ye will not shew the King this letter, but put it in the safe custodie of Mister Vulcan."

Hearne informs us, that this letter is reported to have at one

while his favour at Court made him unpopular, and his natural courage too often haughty and unrelenting[1], his conduct was distinguished by many imprudences. Whatever may have been his errors, certain it is that he regarded his lady with fond affection, and he evinced his attachment towards her at his death by the most indubitable proofs[2].

The friendship which Buckingham conceived for Laud, induced him to appoint the Bishop his chaplain on the 15th of June, 1622, and from him he received the sacrament at Greenwich on the following day[3]. Next month we find Laud making

time been in the possession of Archbishop Sancroft, and that it is the only amour in which the Prince was known to have been concerned.

[1] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, fol. vol. i.

[2] Sir Henry Wotton's Life of the Duke.

[3] Diary, p. 5. Prynne's Breviate, p. 3. In his Diary, Laud says, "I became C. to my lord of Buckingham;" and Prynne, therefore, to establish his Popish insinuations, says, that he became Confessor. Allowing this to be the case, it by no means follows that the word "Confessor" has no other meaning than the Popish one, or that which is attached as connected with the functions of the Romish ecclesiastics; but whether the Bishop meant so or not, may be justly questioned. The letter C is all that he expresses, and it may as well mean Chaplain. Heylin (p. 96) has adopted the word Confessor, because he had used Prynne's corrupted edition of the Diary.—Abbot observed this intimacy with uneasiness and jealousy, Narrative, apud Rushworth's Col. vol. i. p. 440. "This man," says he, "is the only inward counsellor with Buckingham, sitting with him sometimes privately whole hours, and feeding his humour with spite and malice."

a visitation of his diocese, diligently preaching, and arranging the affairs of his extensive see, and returning from Wales to London in the ensuing August. He remained in London in attendance at the Court, preaching at various places in the city, until the 27th of January, when he left the metropolis, and was inducted into the rectory of Creeke, near Peterborough, on the 31st,—a benefice which the King had given him *in commendam*[1]. On the 5th of February, we find him again with the King at London, and he informs us that he received a book from his Majesty, written by a Capuchin friar, who had been once a Protestant, proving from the ninth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where an account is given of St. Paul's vision, that the body of Christ had been actually in two places at once[2]. On the 9th of February, the Bishop returned it to the King, with his own remarks upon it, and on that day we find him holding his first ordination, which he has piously recorded[3].

In the meanwhile, the negotiations were proceeding for Charles' marriage with the Infanta—which James had vigorously prosecuted, in the hope that by it the Palatinate would be recovered for his son-in-law. But the Spanish armies and their allies had committed the most dreadful ravages in the country of the unfortunate Elector,

[1] Diary, p. 6. [2] Ibid. ut sup.

[3] Ibid. ut sup. "Promovi Edmundum Provant Scotum in Presbyterium. Primogenitus meus fuit in Domino."

contrary to their professions of amity and peace, and had left that prince only the towns of Heidelburg, Frankendale, and Meinhem, which owned his authority. James, displeased with the conduct of the Spanish monarch, and wearied with the anxieties of delay, was resolved that the intended treaty should either be completed at once or annulled. For this purpose it was planned that the Prince should proceed to Spain in disguise, and leave England without the knowledge of the Court and the English Council. Charles eagerly embraced the design, for besides his being as intent on the marriage as the King, several circumstances occurred which made him more anxious for the journey. Accordingly he set out, accompanied only by Buckingham and Sir Richard Graham, Buckingham's Master of the Horse. The affair was known only to a very few persons at Court in the confidence of the King, of whom Laud was one, whom Buckingham left as his confidential agent and correspondent while he was abroad.

Buckingham has received the merit of contriving this extraordinary and hazardous adventure,—hazardous, certainly, when we reflect on the consequences which might have attended the discovery of the Prince's rank while abroad. Lord Clarendon informs us, that the Duke's great favour with the King, had almost made him forget his duty to the Prince, whom one day he almost attacked with personal violence, for which conduct the Prince was greatly enraged; and that he planned this journey

to recover his affection, in which he succeeded to his wish. The adventures of the Prince and his two companions on the way are not less extraordinary. They set out on Tuesday, Feb. 18, from a house belonging to Buckingham at Newhall, in Essex, with false beards, and assuming the names of Thomas and John Smith. When they were crossing the Thames at Gravesend, they discovered that they had no silver, upon which they presented the waterman with gold. The poor man was so astonished and overjoyed at his unusual good fortune, and so grieved that such gentlemen, as they appeared, should be journeying, as he thought, to the Continent to decide a private quarrel, that he could not refrain from acquainting the authorities of the town with his suspicions. They sent after the travellers as far as Rochester to stop them, but the Prince and his companions did not halt in that city. When they were on Clapham Hill, they were again in danger of discovery, by the appearance of the French ambassador, with the King's coach, and some of the royal household, but they passed from the high road through fields, leaping hedges and ditches, till they were out of sight. At Canterbury, some suspicious rumours had preceded them, and the Mayor attended in person, alleging, that he had a warrant to arrest them on suspicion, first, from the council; secondly, from Sir Lewis Lewknor, Master of the Ceremonies; and, thirdly, from Sir Henry Manwaring, Lieutenant of Dover Castle. This fictitious speech was delivered in a

ludicrous manner, and Buckingham could not retain his gravity; but at length he discovered himself, and informed the Mayor, that he was proceeding privately with two attendants to take a secret view of the King's fleet, to observe in what state of forwardness it was, some preparations being then making for service. As Buckingham was Admiral, he was readily believed, and was accordingly permitted to depart. After they left the city, however, a post-boy, who had been frequently at Court, discovered who they were, and they were compelled to bribe him to silence. They arrived at Dover at six in the evening, where Sir Francis Cottingham, secretary to the Prince, and Mr. Endymion Porter, were in attendance. They had been sent before to provide a vessel, and they joined the party;—Porter being admitted as confidential servant, from his knowledge of the Spanish language, and his popularity in Spain, whither he had been in an official capacity. They all embarked at six the following morning, and landed at Boulogne about two o'clock in the afternoon, whence they proceeded to Montreuil that night, where they slept, and arrived at Paris the next day. The Prince spent a whole day in viewing the city and the court, and he and Buckingham more effectually disguised themselves by purchasing large periwigs, which concealed their foreheads. They beheld the King and Queen without discovery, though Cadmet, who had been ambassador to England, was in attendance. In the evening, overhearing some

persons discoursing about a mask to which they were going, at which the Princesses were to be present, they joined the crowd, and were admitted by the Duke de Montbaçon, the Queen's chamberlain, from civility to strangers; and here the Prince first saw the beautiful Henrietta Maria, his future queen, with the dauphiness and other ladies. It has been asserted that he was captivated by her on this occasion, but this is not the case: it is certain, however, that she excited his admiration, and that, as the issue proved, he did not forget this occasion. The travellers left Paris about three on the following morning, and proceeded to Bayonne, the last town on the frontiers of France, having previously purchased some articles of dress at Bourdeaux. Here Cottingham was employed to prevent their being entertained by the Duke D'Espernon, by informing him that they were of low extraction, and unaccustomed to politeness. It was Lent, and there was no animal food to be got at the inns, but meeting with a flock of kids near Bayonne, the Prince shot one of them, for which he satisfied the goat-herd, and succeeded in conveying it to their lodgings unobserved. While at Bayonne, they were carefully observed by the famous Count de Grammont, the lieutenant of that frontier, who suspected that they were in disguise, yet he allowed them to pass without examination. We are informed, however, that the French Court having got notice of the quality of their visitors, sent messengers after them to stop them, but they had already

passed into Spain. Four days after they left Bayonne, they arrived at Madrid, and proceeded to the house of the English ambassador, the Earl of Bristol. Buckingham, who went by the name of Thomas Smith, first entered the house, carrying a portmanteau, and then John Smith, (the Prince,) was called, who was waiting on the opposite side of the street. They were afterwards received by the Spanish Court with great hospitality, but Buckingham conducted himself so haughtily to the Prince, and so insolently to the Spanish favourite, the Duke de Olivarez, that his behaviour was one of the causes why this match was frustrated[1].

This journey has been called accidental, and Sir Simon D'Ewes declares, that none, except the King, knew the Prince's resolution. "Their going," says he, "was so secret, that none, I believe, in England knew it till they were in France[2]." The utmost concern was evinced by the English nation for the Prince's safety, and the Puritans were not behind in their declamations about Popery and Popish inclinations. Nor did Laud escape, for, as he had been left by the Duke as his agent at court, it was well known that he corresponded with Buckingham, and he was charged with being privy to the whole design. The travellers were declared to have gone into Spain for the purpose of betraying their religion, with the King's consent; and Laud, who was frequently at

[1] Howell's Letters, vol. i. sect. 3. No. xv. xvi. &c. edit. 1650. Strafford's Letters, vol. i.

[2] Life of Sir Simon D'Ewes, fol. 67.

the Court, heard the old scandal revived, with double violence, against himself. Now, that the King, while he was anxious for the success of this matrimonial alliance, was no less careful about the reformed religion, appears most evident from all the documents on the subject, and particularly by the instructions he gave to Sir Kenelm Digby, at the beginning of this negotiation, in which he says, "The matter of religion is to us of most principal consideration, for nothing can be to us dearer than the honour and safety of the religion we profess: and therefore, seeing that this marriage, if it shall take place, is to be with a lady of a different religion from us, it becometh us to be tender, as on the one part, to give them all satisfaction convenient; so on the other, to admit nothing that may blemish our conscience, or detract from the religion here established[1]." But this monarch's language was so studiously perverted by many, that they actually contrived to force other meanings on the words than they really conveyed. The conduct of the Prince while in Spain, in duly attending the Protestant worship, notwithstanding his public communications with the Popish powers, is a sufficient argument against those who believe these insinuations[2].

As to Laud's share in the transaction, Prynne declares, in his publication of the Breviat, that he was

[1] Apud Heylin, p. 98, 99. Hidden Works of Darkness, p. 34.

[2] Life of Laud, p. 100, 101.

privy to the Prince's journey into Spain, which was purposely plotted to pervert him to the Popish religion, which he assumes from the Earl of Bristol's impeachment of the Duke in 1626. This he endeavours to make evident, from a prayer which Laud composed on the occasion, and which, had he only read it, would have completely silenced him on that cavil[1]. It is also charged against him, that he wrote a letter to Buckingham, the fifth day after his departure; that he was a party to some expressions which the King had used to the Prince before he left the Court; and, as James, in some of his productions, had called the Pope Antichrist, by which a barrier might arise in procuring the Pope's dispensation for the marriage, that the King urged the Prince to declare, that he had written nothing on that point but by way of argument[2]. Now, this, which Prynne imagined to be quite conclusive, completely refutes himself; for it is undeniable that the King could only affirm that the Pope was Antichrist by way of argument. If the King said, "the Pope was Antichrist," he made an assertion which he was called upon to prove; for the Pope and his defenders denied it *in toto:* there was only, then, an assertion, and how could the King prove it in any other way than by argument? If Laud was present at this interview, which is doubtful, what

[1] Breviate, p. 14.

[2] Canterburie's Doome, by Prynne, p. 276, and Hidden Works of Darkness, p. 34, 35.

reasonable objection could he make to the King's assertion, seeing that he had confuted the Jesuit solely by argument? But the assertions of Prynne are nugatory; for, though he wrote to Buckingham the fifth day after the Prince's departure, it must not be forgotten that the whole affair was then no longer a secret, but that it was publicly known over all England: and besides, the letters which he received from the Duke contain not the slightest foundation for the assertion. But how absurd is it to say, that, because Laud was acquainted with the King's observation to the Prince, therefore he was one of the cabinet-council! as if there were no other methods for a man in Laud's situation to become acquainted with a fact, than by being personally present. Might not the King himself inform Laud after his departure? Might not Laud be informed by the Prince after his return? There were, in truth, many ways of becoming acquainted with it, without such a necessity. "Yet this whole passage," says the fanatical Puritan, "was known to him (Laud), and he privy to this secret, not known formerly to others; therefore, he *was certainly* one of the privy council who was privy to the Prince's going into Spain, and to the private instructions given him by King James before his departure: yea, very likely, one that suggested this distinction to King James, to please the Pope, and promote the match, and therefore he could not but speak with the King about it, who hereupon commanded this Bishop to qualify his expressions in

these particulars, and so not to differ from the known judgment of his pious and learned father, from whose orthodox judgment, notwithstanding, the Arminians might freely dissent both from his Majesty's and this arch-prelate's approbation; after which we may infallibly conclude, from his (Laud's) own pen, that all the forementioned purgations of passages against the Papacy, Pope, and his being Antichrist, were made by this Archbishop's own especial direction, without any other suggestion than his own Romish genius and good affection to the Pope, to induce a more easy reconciliation with him[1]." But had this fanatic not been hurried away by his constant love of scribbling, he might have saved himself the trouble to prove that the Pope is Antichrist from these absurd premises; but the Prynnes, and Pyms, and other worthies of that age, were phrenzied by their enthusiasm, and unable to reason from the fierceness of their hatred to the Church, though they had facts before them which required no demonstration.

Charles scarcely ever saw the Infanta while he was in Spain; and at last the whole affair ended in an open rupture. On this occasion, however, happened the cause of the dispute between Laud and Bishop Williams, the Lord Keeper, which ended in the disgrace of the latter. The King, while the Prince was absent, not wishing altogether to inflame the Popish recusants, who, by the representations

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 276.

of their emissaries, could make an ample retaliation by securing the Prince, relaxed the severity of those laws which were in force against them. It was not long before the Puritans began their clamour, as if the King had actually intended to establish the Romish Church, never reflecting that the relaxing of a law is a very different thing from its total abrogation. And the extreme facility with which they found means to express their visionary alarms, was equalled by the patronage which they received. A letter was immediately addressed by Archbishop Abbot to the King, in which he denounced the negotiation, declared against toleration, and prophesied the wrath and judgment of God upon the whole nation. This letter would have been well enough, had it been appropriate; but the author was completely mistaken. "I have been too long silent," says the primate, "and am afraid, by my silence, I have neglected the duty of the place it hath pleased God to call me unto, and your Majesty to place me in. Your Majesty hath propounded a toleration of religion; I beseech you to take into your consideration what your act is, and what the consequence may be; by your act you labour to set up the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome, the whore of Babylon! And hereunto I add, what you have done, in sending the Prince into Spain, without consent of your council, the privity and approbation of your people: and although you have a charge and interest in the Prince, as son of your flesh, yet have the people a greater, as son of this

kingdom, upon whom, next after your Majesty, are their eyes fixed, and welfare depends, and so tenderly is his going apprehended, as, believe it, however his return may be safe, yet the drawers of him into this action, so dangerous to himself, so desperate to the kingdom, *will not pass away unquestioned, unpunished.*—What dreadful consequences these things may draw afterwards, I beseech your Majesty to consider, and, above all, lest by this toleration, and discountenancing of the true profession of the gospel, wherewith God hath blessed us, and this kingdom hath so long flourished under it, your Majesty do not draw upon this kingdom in general, and yourself in particular, God's heavy wrath and indignation[1]."

Whether Abbot was really the author of this letter may be questioned; yet it cannot be denied, from the extract given above, that the language is extraordinary. As I have just said, had there, even in that hazardous age, been any warrant for its assertions, it would have been completely justifiable, nor would Abbot have done his duty as governor of the Church, had he allowed any thing like an emancipation of the Papists to pass unobserved *without opposition.* But Abbot well knew that toleration is widely different from emancipation, and that a mere protection is not equivalent to a full removal of all disabilities, and a formal recognition of the Romish Church. He knew, moreover,

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 85.

that nothing could be farther from the King's intentions than to patronise the Papists—men, who, like the Puritans, were continually intriguing against him; the very nature of whose religion, because they held certain mischievous dogmas, was faction and conspiracy, or intolerable arrogance and presumption. And, as it is impossible to recognise Popery, without admitting the Pope's supremacy, he did not require to be told the mind of the King on that subject. He knew that the King was tenacious of his prerogative to a proverb, and he loved it too well, as Dr. Heylin remarks, "to quit any part thereof to the Pope of Rome, and, consequently, to part with that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, as he must have done by a toleration, which he esteemed the fairest flower in the royal garland." He knew, besides, that the Papists would disdain yielding obedience to James, inasmuch as their dangerous politics denounced him at once, if he would not do homage to the Pontiff. And, in fine, Abbot knew that the King had repeatedly declared, that he would defend the Church of England till his dying day; that he would leave religion established as he found it; that he had been fighting, since the day of his Accession, to restrain, on the one hand, the absurdities of Popery, and on the other, the intolerable extravagances of Puritanism.

It has been asserted that Abbot was not the author of this letter, but that it was an effusion of the Puritan faction, who had borrowed his name

to give it greater authority [1]. But when we recollect that the Primate had all along been held as the head and patron of those zealots,—that he had through life manifested the greatest anxiety for the prevalence of Calvinism,—and that he admitted into the Church those men who afterwards betrayed it, there is no reason to adopt this opinion. Yet it is remarkable, that though Abbot was actually concerned in this letter, he afterwards signed the articles of marriage, nay, was the first who did so, and thus countenanced an alliance which he had said would incur the vengeance of heaven, and that, too, in the face of this very toleration, against which he had so violently protested [2].

But be this as it may, perhaps, after all, it was hardly a matter of prudence, though one of state policy, to propose this toleration, as the event proved. For no sooner had the Papists got the idea, than they began, as usual, to conduct themselves with insolence. The Pope presumed to nominate bishops to all the dioceses in England, that they might exercise episcopal jurisdiction, as his bishops do at this day in Ireland; and issued various orders to his emissaries to be indefatigable in the spread of the superstition. But Dr. Williams, having got notice of this, instantly acquainted the King, who, enraged at the presumption of this nomination, and viewing it both as an encroachment on his prero-

[1] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 105, 106.

[2] Life and Reign of James. p. 60. Sanderson, p. 550.

gative, and as taking advantage of his own goodness, at once ended his negotiations with the Court of Rome.

The Marquis of Buckingham, during his absence, had been advanced to ducal honours, and, in the mean time, Bishop Williams, who had originally disdained to make court to that nobleman, because he thought that his favour with the King could not be of long continuance, took an active part in fomenting the discontent of the people, and endeavoured to undermine Buckingham in the royal favour. Laud observed this, and felt himself compelled in honour to acquaint a nobleman who had entrusted him with his confidence, with the proceedings of the Lord Keeper. Buckingham had before this time become less familiar with Williams, but he felt peculiarly mortified that a man, whom he had been the instrument of raising to power and influence, should thus endeavour to throw all the popular odium on him on account of the intended Spanish alliance. He hastened home, therefore, from a country with which he had already become disgusted, and in which his own conduct had aided considerably to make him unpopular; resolved to oppose the marriage, and publicly declared that the Spanish Court had acted with duplicity; had amused the Prince by delays, and had no intention of yielding the Palatinate: and that, on these accounts, the King ought to finish at once all treaties with Spain, by a formal proclamation that they would not be fulfilled.

Without, however, detailing at length the political transactions of this period, it may be proper to mention, that from this time Buckingham resolved to supplant Williams, though without success, during James' reign. This was the occasion, too, of the dispute between Laud and that prelate, which was never afterwards reconciled. Williams accused Laud of ingratitude, while Laud, on the other hand, charged him with duplicity and selfishness. A rooted enmity took place between them[1].

Leaving these contentions, however, for a more lengthened detail and examination under another form, while Buckingham was in Spain, Archbishop Abbot, still farther to oppose Laud as long as he was able, left him out of the High Commission, nor was Bishop Williams now forward to get his name inserted. Of this insult, rendered doubly so from the quarter whence it came, Laud complained afterwards to Buckingham, whose influence soon got him nominated. Various altercations passed between him and Williams, who, says Laud, was jealous of Buckingham's favour towards him[2]. So great indeed was their enmity, that we find Laud making the following entry in his Diary, dated Jan. 25, 1623-4, "It was Sunday, I was alone, and languishing with I know not what sadness. I was much concerned at the envy and undeserved hatred borne to me by the Lord Keeper. I took

[1] Ambrose Philips' Life of Archbishop Williams. Cambridge, 1708, p. 150, 151.

[2] Diary, p. 7, 8.

into my hands the Greek New Testament, that I might read the portion of the day. I lighted upon the 13th chapter to the Hebrews, wherein that of David, Psal. lvi. occurred to me then, grieving and fearing. 'The Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man can do unto me.' I thought an example was set to me; and who is not safe under that shield? Protect me, O Lord my God[1]."

These pious notices cannot fail to appear honourable to Laud, more especially when we recollect that they were written without the slightest anticipation that they were ever to be perused by any one but himself. Two other praiseworthy memorials ought not to be forgotten. On Feb. 1, he informs us, that he was at dinner with the Prince, "who was then very merry, and talked occasionally with many of his attendants, and, among other things, he said, that if he were necessitated to take any particular profession in life, he could not be a lawyer, adding his reasons. 'I cannot,' said he, 'defend a bad cause, nor yield in a good one.'" Two days after this, Laud informs us, that his Controversy with Fisher was put to press, being

[1] This unhappy difference seems to have had great effect on Laud. On December 14th we find him thus recording, "Sunday night I did dream that the Lord Keeper was dead, that I passed by one of his men, who was about a monument for him; that I heard him say, his lower lip was infinitely swollen and fallen, and he rotten already. This dream did trouble me." Diary, p. 7. On various other occasions he has recorded this dispute, from which his uneasiness is remarkably evident.

licensed by the Bishop of London. "I am no controversialist," says he, on this occasion; "may God so love and bless my soul, as I desire and endeavour that all the never to be enough deplored distractions of the Church may be composed happily, to the glory of his holy name."

On the 19th of Feb. 1623-4, the Parliament assembled, in which all the treaties with Spain were dissolved, to the great joy of the people, with whom Buckingham was at this time remarkably popular, on account of his opposition. On the following day the Convocation met, in which we find Laud pursuing his great designs for the welfare of the Church. The subsidies which the King demanded falling heavily on the poorer clergy, Laud devised a plan to relieve them from this burden, which he communicated to the Duke of Buckingham, and that favourite promised to procure the sanction of the King and the Prince. He was commended for it by Williams and the Bishop of Durham; but when he consulted Abbot, he experienced different treatment. The Primate entertained too much private resentment against Laud, to restrain his temper, and he accordingly asked Laud, what business it was of his to concern himself for the Church? and he also told him, that no Bishop at any time had done the like, nor would any one but himself,—that he had wounded the Church in speaking to a layman about it in such a manner as could never be healed; and that, if the Duke properly understood him, he would

never again permit him to enter his presence. These sentiments, so ridiculous and uncourteous, Laud heard with his accustomed dignity. "I thought," replied he, "I had done a very good office for the Church, and so did my betters think. If your Grace thinks otherwise, I am sorry I have offended you. And I hope, being done out of a good mind, for the support of so many poor vicars abroad in the country, who must needs sink under three subsidies in a year, my error, if it is one, is pardonable." Laud had been in the situation of a poor clergyman himself, and knew well the hardships such would have to encounter: but Abbot, who had been promoted from the University to a Bishopric, knew little of their necessitous circumstances. Abbot's conduct compelled him to acquaint the Duke with his reception, lest his enemies should take advantage of it, and he thus expresses himself on the occasion: "Sic Deus beet me servum suum, laborantem sub pressura eorum, qui semper voluerunt mala mihi [1]."

Laud, notwithstanding his connexion with the Duke, opposed his design of appropriating the funds of the Charter-house for the maintenance of an army. Buckingham maintained, that it would be for the advantage of the King and the ease of the subject; but the Bishop's generous nature made him vigorously oppose the scheme, for he rightly thought, that all these foundations should be held sacred and

[1] Diary, p. 11, 12.

inviolable. And he clearly saw, that were such appropriations once to take place, there could be no security for the rest, inasmuch as all these endowments, venerable on account of the pious intentions of the founders, might be seized on the slightest emergency, and thus become solely under the controul of the monarch or his favourites. James had endeavoured, some years before, to make a similar appropriation of another endowment, and he would have been successful, had not Sir Edward Coke, the Lord Chief Justice, opposed him, at the price of disgrace at Court. But that celebrated lawyer preserved his reputation, and Laud, with such an example before him, though he certainly did not wish to incur the King's resentment, nevertheless resolved to give a decided negative to a proposition of which he could not conscientiously approve.

From these proceedings, however, Laud was called to theological subjects. The Duke requested him to detail the tenets of what is called Doctrinal Puritanism, as held by the Calvinists. Laud complied, and presented him with them, divided into ten heads. These divisions were, a definition of the ideas of the Puritans about the observance of the Sabbath, the polity of the Church, the power of the King in ecclesiastical matters, confession and absolution, and the five points on predestination[1].

[1] "The Duke had a desire to know them, and he served him in it. I must needs say, the name of Doctrinal Puritanism is not very ancient, but whether first taken up by the Archbishop

On these subjects, Laud dilated to the Duke's satisfaction, shewing the fallacy of their positions, and the dangerous tendency of their doctrines, if carried to an extreme. The Calvinistic notions, which had long raged on the Continent among the Reformed Churches, were now assuming a new aspect in the Church of England; and the Papists, who were continually on the watch, took the opportunity to blend Calvinism and the doctrines of the Church of England, and to make them both bear against the truths of the Reformation. And it was not till Dr. Richard Montague, Prebendary of Windsor, severely attacked the Jesuits, in reply to one of their lucubrations, that the Recusants were silenced, and the individual theories of Calvin exposed with success [1].

of Spalato, at his being here, I am not able to say. Nor am I of opinion that Puritanism and Calvinism are convertible terms; for, though all Puritans are Calvinists, both in doctrine and practice, yet all Calvinists are not also to be reckoned Puritans, whose practices many of them abhor, and whose unconformities they detest; though, by the error of their education, or ill direction in the course of their studies, they may and do agree with them in some points of doctrine." Heylin, p. 119.

[1] "The priests and Jesuits," says Heylin, "having been very busy of late in gaining proselytes, and sowing their erroneous doctrines, had got a haunt in a village of the county of Essex, called Stamford Rivers. The rector of that church was Richard Montague, Bachelor in Divinity, Prebendary of Windsor, and one of the Fellows of Eton College, a man exceedingly well versed in the Fathers, &c. Desirous to free his parish from this haunt, he left some propositions at the house of one of his neighbours, who had been frequently visited by these night spirits,

The clamour which was raised by the Calvinists against these proceedings, accorded with their previous conduct. The old cry of Popery and Arminianism was sounded abroad, as if indeed the doctrines of universal redemption to all men, if they truly repent, were never heard of until they were taught by the Dutch professor. But while these disputes were agitated, in which Laud fought manfully for truth, the Parliament, having gained their purposes, were celebrating their triumphs for the dissolution of the Spanish treaties, while the audacity of the Jesuits and priests was somewhat abated by the result. After the prorogation of Parliament preparations were made for war with Spain, which, however, were happily suspended. The Prince recollected the beauty of the accomplished Henrietta Maria, and proposals were made to Lewis XIII. for the marriage. The proposals were accepted, and a treaty entered into with the French monarch, to the renewed mortification of the Puritans, who declaimed as violently against this alliance as they had done against that with Spain. But while these negotiations were in progress, which Laud is charged

with this declaration thereunto, that if any of those who ranged that walk would convince him in any of the same, he would immediately be a Papist." It appears that the Jesuits accepted the challenge, and produced a pamphlet, entitled, "A New Gag for the Old Gospel," in which it was pretended that the doctrines of the Protestants could be confuted out of the very words of their own English Bibles. Montague found it a compound of errors and absurdities, which required little pains to refute.

by Prynne with promoting[1], an unexpected event occurred, which engrossed for a time the attention of the nation.

On the 24th of March, 1624-5, King James departed this life at Theobalds, in Hertfordshire. He was seized with a tertian ague, which baffled the skill of his physicians, and brought his life to a close. Laud was preaching at Whitehall when the sorrowful tidings were conveyed to him, which being whispered to him, he stopped in the middle of his discourse[2]. The King bore his last illness with patience and Christian resignation: having recited the Creed, and received the Holy Eucharist, he assured his attendants that he felt tranquil and happy, and, declaring that he died in peace with all men, calmly expired in the 59th year of his age.

No monarch, perhaps, has been more abused than James I.; nor shall I, after the numerous contradictory delineations of character, enlarge very much in his vindication. It seems to have been the determination of every writer to heap additional insult on the memory of this traduced monarch, and those who have defended him have been no less subjected to censure. His hatred of persecution, his desire of granting a toleration to the Papists, and his opposition to the Puritan faction, have been magnified as the greatest crimes; and he has been calumniated by fanatics as the weakest and the worst of kings.

[1] Hidden Works of Darkness, p. 73. [2] Diary, p. 15.

He has been called a traitor to religion, though he was never a Calvinist; an enemy to liberty, though he maintained no more than his rightful ascendancy over hot-headed and seditious enthusiasts: because he was a scholar, the most learned Prince of his age, or, perhaps, of those who ever sat on the English throne, he has been held up to ridicule and contempt as a weak-minded pedant; and because he was a resolute defender of the Church of England, he has been vilified as a doctrinal Papist, and an ecclesiastical tyrant. Yet surely justice will be done to the memory of a prince whose only failing was his love of peace; who had adopted as his motto, *Beati pacifici;* whom the worst censure can only accuse of pushing to an extreme his favourite object, the eternal interests of his factious subjects [1].

The reign of James was not one pregnant with disasters, but it was the prelude to calamities which his son was destined to encounter. He had found England at peace, and at peace he left it, but about to be rent by a faction, which had been struggling

[1] The observations of James at the Hampton Court Conference discovered a strong intellect, and he easily perceived the Puritanical hypocrisy in the pretended zeal for his prerogative. He was invariably jealous of Popish interference, and we find, that in all foreign negotiations, he preserved his independence. The real truth seems to be this: it is because the annals of James' reign are not connected with battles and bloodshed, with war and military armaments; it is because there is no record of the intrigues of ministers and the craftiness of cabinets, that the monarch has been called pusillanimous and contemptible.

for the mastery nearly half a century. We are told by the Puritan historian, that "both Popery and Puritanism increased during his reign, while the friends of the hierarchy sunk into contempt;" and this, first, by "their (the Puritans) standing firm by the constitution and laws of the country; secondly, by their steady adherence to the doctrines of Calvin, and the Synod of Dort, on the points of predestination and grace, against the modern interpretations of Arminius and his followers;" thirdly, "by their pious and severe manner of life, which was at this time very extraordinary." Such are the profound reasons of Neal for the protection of British liberty, which have been echoed by his admirers to the present time. But the history of the Puritan faction furnishes abundant proofs, that what they called "standing firm to the constitution and laws," was the merest pretext, inasmuch as it consisted in continually annoying their sovereign on subjects which they themselves admitted to be of trifling or secondary import, in opposing him, inflaming the people, and preaching fanatical and seditious sermons. And we well know that the doctrines of Calvin engendered strife and conspiracy, and seeing that it is folly to assert that these doctrines preserved the constitution, it is no difficult matter to pronounce on the subject. Who requires to be told, that from the first dawn of Puritanism, intrigue and faction shewed their hateful influences—that Elizabeth's reign was one of plots and disturbances between them and the Papists,—that

James' life was embittered by their hostile contentions,—and that the novelties of Geneva hurried them into excesses which constantly gathered strength, and finally overthrew the constitution? Calvinism and British liberty are not, and cannot be, identified; the one is the offspring of a foreign soil, and frequently introducing intolerance and tyranny, as it did in Scotland; while British liberty was established long before Calvin's notions were known.

The turbulence of Scotland has been charged on James as the effect of his apostasy from Calvinism. But if that monarch's motives be taken into account, we shall soon see that his conduct was highly laudable, though he was unsuccessful in all his endeavours. A union of the two kingdoms was his great object, but in that age of enthusiasm it was not likely that such a union could have been effected without a uniformity of religion. He had the welfare of his Scottish subjects at heart; he thought on Scotland as the land of his birth, where his ancestors had long swayed the sceptre, where his mother, the most beautiful Princess in Europe, kept her court. He wished to see the two kingdoms consolidated into one powerful monarchy, which evidently arose from his Scottish partialities. He saw that Scotland could not benefit England by such a union; that the latter was the more powerful, and that sooner or later the former must lose its independence; but the advantage would be on the side of Scotland, the inhabitants of the two kingdoms would forget their mutual animosities, and they would be formed into

one brotherhood; the arts and sciences of England would rescue the Scottish people from their ignorance, English agriculture would render the barren soil of the north more fruitful, its inhabitants industrious, its future prosperity certain. But in that age of enthusiasm, uniformity of religion seemed to James to be indispensable; he recollected the intolerance of the Calvinistic ministers, and the tyranny of the Presbytery which they had established: hence, when the Church became united, one religious bond connected the two nations; their cause was one; they were friends and brothers.

Sectarian curiosity has pried into the private life of James; it has discovered that he was indolent, and prone to vices; that his conversation was unbecoming, indecent, and profane: it has delighted in recording his imprudences, and his failings have been magnified into heinous transgressions. While I need not stop to notice the wickedness and fanaticism of such mean retaliations, it is to be observed, that when he was sensible of his errors, his repentance was sincere; his failings were those of the head, not of the heart, and they were, moreover, trivial in themselves. Politeness is a relative term, which has different gradations in every age and place; nor can we in justice estimate the language of our fathers according to our own ideas of moral feeling. Nor is it true, as his enemies have alleged, that he was versatile and insincere in religion. Throughout life he preserved his affection towards the Reformation; the welfare of the Church was his

highest aim, he wished to be a Christian, not a worldly monarch. He was a munificent patron of learning and of learned men; and the celebrated Bacon, whose testimony alone might suffice, has said, that he had "a right to the character of the celebrated Hermes Trismegistus;" that he united "the sovereignty of a prince, the illumination of a priest, and the learning of a philosopher, in the same person." One dangerous expedient adopted by James was his publication of the Book of Sports, in which he asserted the lawfulness of recreations on the Sabbath-day. While we must make allowances for the age; while we must recollect that he did it from a very fallacious principle to counteract and restrain that gloomy fanaticism which the Puritan theology had engendered, by which religion became an intolerable burden, instead of a pleasing and edifying duty; while it was designed, also, to allure the Papists to the Church, and was limited in its operations; it must not be denied that all such proclamations are dangerous to morality, and inconsistent with religious truth. None, except religious zealots, will deny that the Christian Sabbath should be a day of cheerful relaxation, in which the lower classes may enjoy, after their six days of anxious toil and labour, the sweets of innocent recreation, nor in the command, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," are we to understand that inherent holiness which is the essential attribute of Heaven, and to which, in this state of imperfection, we can never attain. The austerity and gloom of those who

would deny to the labourer and the mechanic, confined for six days in unhealthy abodes, and doomed to unclean employments, the salubrious walk and the recreation from toil and care, are to be condemned; but thus far can we go, and no farther. The Sabbath ought to be a day of rest as it is a day of solemn observance; and they who forget and wilfully neglect "the assembling of themselves together," may certainly be considered as careless and reckless of their future welfare. While innocent conversation may be allowed, and, indeed, is necessary to divert the mind from the more solemn and severe meditations on religion, no sounds of boisterous mirth ought to be heard on that hallowed day; no display of worldly-mindedness; no rude jests should be uttered, nor "the loud laugh, which speaks the vacant mind." Among the higher classes the abuse of the Christian Sabbath is to be positively condemned. Six days they have for their fashionable pursuits, and enjoyments; cannot they rest for one day in seven? Cannot they shew that they are not dead to every religious feeling? And they ought to reflect, that example is contagious; that it is a powerful authority; and that their conduct is observed by their humble brethren, who imitate their vices without having the prudence to restrain themselves within proper bounds. The observance of the Sabbath is imperative on all men, and it is not difficult to estimate the morality of a people who disregard its holy institutions.

The two great errors of James' life, connected

with the Church, was the promotion of Abbot to the primacy, and his countenancing the Synod of Dort. The administration of the former issued in disasters: discipline was neglected, enthusiasm was patronised: and the Calvinists whom he admitted into the Church at last accomplished its overthrow. On the Synod of Dort, little need be said. The dogmas of Calvin were introduced into the Church, and had most lamentable effects; and advantage was taken of this act of James, (which he did merely from political motives, and chiefly from his personal friendship towards Prince Maurice,) to traduce him for his conduct, and still further to prove his hypocrisy and irreligion. Nothing was evidently farther from James' thoughts than to patronise Calvinism, which he had never thoroughly believed, and which, since the period of his Accession, he had steadily opposed [1].

[1] I confess that I am far from being satisfied with the observations of many writers, that James was at this time disposed to favour Calvinism from principle, for, though he certainly committed a grievous error in sending deputies, yet his share of the transaction was altogether political. The Calvinists, with Maurice at their head, were not actuated by zeal for purity of doctrine, but were determined to crush the Arminians, who were supplanting them. Bangny's Life of Grotius, edit. 1754. Wilson's King James, in Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 716-724. Camden's Annals of King James, p. 649. Grotius, Apolog. c. ix. Le Vassor's Histoire de Louis XIII. lib. iv. It was suspected that James was unfavourable to Calvinism, and hence the anxiety to make him a party against the Arminians. Causabon's Epistles, No. 933. James wrote against Arminius, it is true, but it was only when

And what can be said on James' alleged pedantry? It is well for men to declaim, when they are blinded by prejudice, and stimulated by hatred; these baneful passions preclude them from seeing "any good thing in Nazareth." The mind of James was neither sordid nor ambitious, and he delighted more in intellectual pleasures than in the vain and ephemeral pageantries of state. His literary talents are entitled to the greatest respect, and his version of the Psalms has been characterised by Pope as the best in the English language. But it was in theological learning that he excelled. This enabled him to judge of the disputes of the age, and prevented him from becoming a dupe to the fanaticism of the Puritans[1].

he took the doctrines which are called Arminian on the shewing of the Calvinists. The proceedings of this Synod, far more intolerant than any Popish Council, as I have stated in the text, will make it be remembered with the liveliest indignation by every good man. We may discover in it the uniform spirit of Calvinistic intolerance. The persecution of the Arminians, the deposition of Episcopius and other great men, the execution of Barnevelt, Grand Pensioner of Holland, the imprisonment of Hoogerbetz, and also of the celebrated Grotius, from which, however, he escaped by the stratagem of his wife, were all the fruits of Dutch Presbyterianism.

[1] In these remarks on the literary character of James, I am glad to find an author with whom I completely agree. I refer to Mr. I. D'Israeli, who, in his excellent work entitled "Calamities of Authors," 12mo. London, 1812, vol. ii. p. 245, has these remarks, honourable at once to the memory of the monarch, and to the liberal feeling of the writer. "From a late examination of his works, let me also protest against the echoed opinions of

Let these remarks, however, suffice at present on the character of this calumniated monarch. Whatever were his failings, they were far out-numbered by his many virtues, by his sincere regard for religion, by his mildness, his clemency, affability, and generous nature. Future generations, I am persuaded, will yet do justice to the memory of James, and his political motives and actions will be properly estimated when enthusiasm has subsided, and when men shall reason with candour and soberness on the memories of the illustrious dead. "He was the Solomon of this age," says the venerable primate of Scotland, "admired for his wise government, and for his knowledge of all manner of learning. For his wisdom, moderation, love of justice, for his patience and piety, which shined above all his other virtues, and is witnessed in the learned works which he left to posterity, his name shall never be forgotten, but remain in honour so long as the world endureth." Bishop Williams,

so many critics; I would plead for the talents of this literary monarch. James was no more a pedant than the ablest of his cotemporaries; nor abhorred more the taste of tobacco, nor feared old witches, than they did: he was a great wit, a most acute disputant; and he discovers a genius far above mediocrity in his excellent *Basilicon Doron*. He would have been a sage for a prince, for his genius went beyond pedantry; Marcus Antoninus was not a greater philosopher, though he was a feebler sovereign. James had formed the most elevated conceptions of the virtues and duties of a monarch, and had his son Henry survived, that nobler genius had embodied the ideal of his father and his preceptor."

the Lord Keeper, preached his funeral sermon, and Laud lamented his death with the utmost sorrow, grieved for the loss of a Prince whom he loved, whose kindness he had experienced, whose worth those only who were about his person could justly appreciate.

CHAPTER VIII.

1625—1627.

Accession of Charles I.—State of the nation—Character of the King—the Duke of Buckingham—Bishop Laud—Proceedings of the King—Intrigues of Laud's enemies—Marriage of Charles I.—Meeting of the First Parliament—Its proceedings—Remarks on it—Dr. Richard Montague—Bishop Williams—Proclamations of the King—Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—Exertions of Laud—His appointment at the Coronation to officiate as Dean of Westminster—The Regalia—He regulates Westminster Abbey—Coronation of Charles I.—The Coronation oath—False charges against Laud—The Second Parliament—Intended impeachment of Buckingham—He is vindicated by the King—Conclusion of the Second Parliament—Practices against Laud—Dr. Goodman—Proclamation of the King.

We now enter on a new era, the reign of Charles I.—a reign pregnant with disasters, and fatal in its termination. The spirit of sedition, which had been restrained, but not subdued, by Elizabeth and James, was destined to break out with overwhelming violence, and to involve both Church and State in one mighty and melancholy ruin.

I have repeatedly declared my conviction, that a time will yet come when justice will be done to the memory of the Stuarts, especially to James and

Charles I. While it can be proved, from undeniable facts, that in many cases they could not act otherwise than they did, it can also be proved that the excesses of the Puritans were the great cause of that licentiousness and irreligion which characterised the Court after the monarchy was restored. Too great pretensions to religion in one party of the state generally produce laxity in the other; and hence it was that Puritanism exhibited religion, not as indeed it is, lovely and attractive, admirably adapted to the wants of man, and elevating his soul above the sublunary enjoyments of time and sense, but as gloomy, austere, and forbidding, imposing unwarrantable restraints on the heart, and subjecting it to a tyranny of fallible men, most revolting to human nature. And driven to desperation by the outrageous fanaticism of the Puritans in this reign, what could those do who were at the helm of power? It was no longer a reluctant obedience, and a mere *verborum prælium*, but it was a struggle which should obtain the mastery; it was a determination by the Puritans to unsheath the sword; they openly declared against toleration, they dogmatically said they would not submit. I need not enumerate the consequences. It is enough to know that the sacred name of religion was abused to serve the ambition and hypocrisy of a faction; that murder and bloodshed stalked abroad in the nation; that the reign of enthusiasm was drawing nigh; and that the beautiful and spiritual ritual of the Church was to be supplanted by the fearful

revelries of disordered imaginations, by canting phraseology, hypocrisy, and tyrannical ambition.

In the twenty-fifth year of his age, Charles I. ascended the throne of England. Educated in the doctrines of the Church of England, he justly reckoned that Church the bulwark of the Protestant Reformation, and felt for it that attachment which he was destined to seal with his blood. A lover of his country and of its sacred institutions, he gave an example by his virtue, his integrity, and his generous valour.

The commencement of a new reign is generally of great importance, according to the state of parties, and the hopes in which they choose to indulge. Had Charles gone over to the Puritans, he might, by uniting with those dark and gloomy religionists, have perhaps averted many of his future calamities; but he was bound by the constitution and the laws to adhere to Church and State, nor could any alterations be effected without the unanimous consent of the nation. If, at the first, he had made concessions to the Puritans, no limits would have been set to their extravagant demands; and, like the Papists, the more favours they received, the greater would have been their insolence. It was necessary for Charles, therefore, to adhere vigorously to the constitution as he found it, and not, by a too facile compliance with the demands of faction, afford dangerous precedents for future actions. Perhaps, after all, in whatever way he acted, his fall was inevitable: the designs of the Calvinists had been in

part premeditated; and it was better, it was nobler, for the King to remain by the constitution, and to be buried in its ruins, than to become the sport of a faction, who would not reason, who would have established a system of religion, in which there was no safeguard from fanaticism, in which every man would have done that which was right in his own eyes, and who would have set up a Calvinistic pope in every parish in England.

Of the ministers of Charles, his state favourite was the Duke of Buckingham. This nobleman was possessed of considerable talents, but he was generally unpopular, because he did not patronise those disordered dreams on religion, which prevailed during that period. Yet it must be admitted, that he was too often arrogant and haughty; that he overlooked or despised the measures of conciliation with the nobles, whom he had disgusted; and his passions frequently hurried him into excesses, which were not becoming in his exalted situation: otherwise, however, Buckingham, though a favourite, was an able minister, and though he has been slandered by his opponents for his private life, he has never been charged as an enemy to his country.

But the King was more fortunate in Laud, who was his principal adviser in the affairs of the Church. Through the interest and friendship of Buckingham, Laud had acquired the favour of Charles, who in him possessed an upright and conscientious minister. This great prelate preserved the same uniform integrity, unmoved by faction, undaunted by

opposition; and it was his wish that the institutions of religion should be preserved inviolate, apart from the absurdities of error, and the extravagance of the Puritan zealots.

On the first day of March, after the death of James, Laud received his appointment to preach before Charles at Westminster, at the opening of the first Parliament. Three days afterwards, the King, who wished to regulate the number of his chaplains, required Laud to draw out a list for him of the most celebrated preachers and divines, with a notice of the principles and qualifications of each, more especially as their number was to be restricted, and their time of officiating more plainly stated. Laud, from his intimate knowledge of the Church, readily complied with this injunction. "The King," says Lord Clarendon, "looked upon the Puritans as a very dangerous and seditious people, who would, under pretence of conscience, which kept them from submitting to the spiritual jurisdiction, take the first opportunity they could find or make, to withdraw themselves from his temporal jurisdiction, and therefore his Majesty caused these people to be watched, and provided against with the utmost vigilance [1]." The Bishop accordingly drew out a list, which he transmitted to the King, in which he clearly distinguished the enemies of the Church from its friends: and thus secured none about the King's person but those who were devoted to the

[1] Clarendon's Hist. of Rebel. vol. i. p. 81.

Reformed Church of England in doctrine and practice[1].

But at this time Laud's enemies were busily at work, in their endeavour to undermine his reputation. The old scandal of his inclination to Popery had either become stale or was disregarded, and his enemies therefore attempted to revive his unfortunate share in the marriage of the Earl of Devonshire[2]. He says, in his Diary, that "a certain person, moved with I know not what envy, blackened my name with King Charles," but who this person was he does not say, and it would be idle to conjecture. He must either have been an emissary of the Primate or of the Lord Keeper, the latter having rapidly declined in Buckingham's favour, and on both of whom the King looked with indifference. The Duke informed Laud of this act of malice, and from the Bishop's expressions of gratitude towards that nobleman, it appears that he completely vindicated him to the King. His enemies had the mortification to witness the failure of their calumnies; for on that very day, the 9th of April, Laud was directed by the King to consult Bishop Andrews about the Convocation which was to meet at the same time with Parliament, and to receive the advice of that learned Prelate respecting the five predestinarian articles which the Synod of Dort

[1] We are told that he distinguished them on the list by the letters O (Orthodox) and P (Puritan). Heylin, p. 127. Collier, vol. ii. p. 733. Neal's Hist. p. 160.

[2] Diary, p. 16.

had declared to be orthodox[1]. The answer of the Bishop was delivered by Laud on the 13th of April, from which it appears that the two Prelates had resolved to prevent the discussion of those dogmas in the Convocation, on account of the number of Calvinists admitted under Abbot's auspices into the Lower House.

On the first of May, the marriage of Charles with the beautiful Henrietta Maria of France, which had been sanctioned in the last reign, was celebrated by proxy in the Church of Notre Dame at Paris. After the funeral of James, at which the King attended as chief mourner, Buckingham departed for France, to conduct the Queen to England. Laud corresponded with that nobleman while he was absent on this important occasion[2]. The King, in the mean time, employed himself in inspecting his navy, and drawing together his army, expecting a war with Spain; but on Trinity Sun-

[1] Laud wished to debate the points of the quinquarticular controversy in this Convocation, and at once shew that they were never at any time the received doctrines of the Church. But Bishop Andrews deprecated the renewal of that disputation which had already done too much mischief, and he successfully prevailed with Laud to relinquish his intentions of bringing forward the subject. It has been asserted, that Arminianism was agitated in this Parliament, which is not the case, nor did it properly become a public question till 1628. Laud was anxious to have it brought before the Convocation, but he was overruled by Bishop Andrews. The conduct of the Commons in condemning Montague's Book was their own act.

[2] Diary, p. 17, 18.

day, June 12, he arrived at Canterbury, where he rested, and that night he received notice that the Queen had arrived at Dover. He departed thither, and the next morning he welcomed Henrietta to England. He brought her thence to Canterbury, and from that city to Gravesend, where, entering the royal barge, they proceeded by water to Westminster, and were there received with every demonstration of affection and joy.

The Parliament, which had been thrice prorogued from the 17th of May, assembled on Saturday, the 18th of June; and on the following day, being the first Sunday after Trinity, Laud preached before the King and the House of Lords at Whitehall, from the second and third verses of the seventh Psalm. On Monday, the 20th, the Convocation met, and an order was sent from the King to the Upper House, commanding the Archbishop of Canterbury, and six other bishops, of whom Laud was one, to advise together, and to appoint a day for a solemn fast and form of prayer, "to implore the divine mercy, now that the pestilence began to spread, and the extraordinary wet weather threatened a famine, and also to beseech the divine blessing upon the fleet, now ready to put to sea[1]." This was done, and the fast was kept by both Houses on the 2d of July, as an example to the whole kingdom.

Charles opened his first Parliament with a short speech, in which he declared those principles by

[1] Diary, p. 19, 20.

which he was guided in after life. He alluded to the aspersion which had been cast upon him, on account of his supposed insincerity to the Protestant Church, and observed, "Because some malicious men may, and, as I hear, have given out, that I am not so true a keeper and maintainer of the true religion that I profess, I assure you that I may with St. Paul say, that I have been trained at Gamaliel's feet; and, although I shall never be so arrogant as to assume unto myself the rest, I shall so far shew the end of it, that all the world may see that none hath been, or ever shall be, more desirous to maintain the truth than I shall." The zealots, in the House of Commons, nevertheless, were not satisfied with these declarations, although they well knew that the King, even were he so inclined, could make no alterations in the Church without the consent of the people. They accordingly presented petitions to Charles, proposing certain articles to restrain the Papists; yet these, though many of them breathing the very spirit of intolerance, received the royal sanction[1].

The Puritan historian remarks, that "it is surprising the King should make these promises to his Parliament within six months after he had signed his marriage articles, in which he had engaged to set all Roman Catholics at liberty, and to suffer

[1] Rushworth's Col. vol. i. p. 172. Clarendon's History of Rebel. vol. i. p. 21. Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 1. Rapin, vol. ii. p. 140. Collier, vol. ii. p. 733, et seq. Neal, vol. ii. p. 161, 162, 163. Diary, p. 20. Heylin, p. 129.

no search or molestation to be given them on account of their religion; but," observes he, "as a judicious writer (Rapin) says, it seems to have been a maxim in this and the last reign, that no faith was to be kept with Parliament." Now, had this miserable politician, when he thought proper to descant on political subjects in his puritanical lucubrations, taken into account the marriage treaty, the "promises to the Parliament," and the King's motives, he might have seen the absurdity of his speculations. For, in conformity with the Church of England, which is, and ever has been, the most tolerant Church in the world towards sectaries, the King promised no more than what he was advised by those very churchmen whom the Puritans reviled as tyrannical and intolerant. But if the Church was intolerant, how, then, could it be the reverse, as the language of these men is evidently contradictory? They had a *toleration*, and why not the Papists? they were both sectarians and schismatics, there was no difference between them, except that the Papists went to the one extreme of absurdity, and they to the other; nor, in truth, were there greater errors uttered at the Romish masses, than in their own conventicles. A toleration is widely different from an emancipation: it is one thing not to molest a man for his religion, and another thing to admit him into power. But what says the King's letter to the Pope, as reported by Neal himself? "Charles declared that he would not marry any mortal whose religion he hated, he (the Pope) might

therefore depend upon it, that he would always abstain from such actions as might testify an hatred to the Roman Catholic religion, and would endeavour that all sinister opinions might be taken away, that, as we all profess one individual Trinity, we may unanimously grow up in one faith." It is evident that the King here speaks as an individual, not as the head of the English nation; and, besides, it does not follow, that since he was not to hate the Popish faith, he was therefore to love it. The most shallow logician must have seen, that the sentiments of the King, and the articles of the treaty, refer merely to private matters, and, in conformity to that proposed treaty, he bound himself not to make his kingdom a scene of persecution and bloodshed, which would have been highly gratifying to the Puritans, who would have rejoiced, notwithstanding their clamours about liberty, to have seen the soil of England drenched with the blood of Papists, who were generally as conscientiously sincere in their religion as themselves. But, then, had those zealots not indulged such opinions, they could not have set forth their assertions about Popery, and the people would not have been alarmed by their own visionary fears. They knew well that the King was too devoted to the Protestant Church, and surrounded by too many who were its zealous defenders, to yield to the persuasions of the Queen, even allowing that "she was a very great bigot to her religion," governed by her confessor, and assisted by the Pope's nuncio.

But the Puritan historian makes the most extraordinary assertion of all, when he says, that, on account of the Queen's influence, "the nation was governed by Popish councils till the Long Parliament," known by its classical name of the *Rump*. And this assertion is the more extraordinary, inasmuch as he admits that Charles was sincere in his religion, "had good natural abilities," and, "with regard to the Church, he was a punctual observer of the ceremonies, and had the highest dislike and prejudice to that part of his subjects that were against the ecclesiastical constitution." I will, however, endeavour to shew, in answer to this falsehood of the Puritan historian, that the King invariably opposed the Papists; that during his reign they were treated with neglect; and, as Neal well knew, the unhappy disputes in which Charles was subsequently engaged, could not, from their very nature, induce him to listen to Popish insinuations, far less to place himself under their control. As to the Queen, indeed, we find by a singular change of feeling, that Buckingham invariably opposed her; and, towards the end of his life, publicly encouraged those who belonged to the Hugonot faction in France. It was his principal design, as Lord Clarendon expressly informs us, to estrange Charles from the Queen; and though he did not succeed, his influence at court was sufficient to counteract the intrigues of her Popish friends. His ambitious love towards Anne of Austria was the cause, and as the French opposed him in his intentions, "he took

all the ways he could," says Clarendon, "to undervalue and exasperate that court and nation, by causing all those that fled from the justice and displeasure of that King to be received and entertained here, not only with ceremony and security, but with bounty and magnificence: and the more extraordinary the persons were, and the more notorious their King's displeasure was towards them, (as in that time there were many lords and ladies in that situation), the more respectfully they were received and entertained. He omitted no opportunity," continues the noble writer, and here are the most remarkable facts, "to incense the King against France, and to dispose him to assist the Hugonots, whom he likewise encouraged to give their King some trouble. He also took great pains to lessen the King's affection towards his Queen, being exceedingly jealous lest her interest might be of force enough to cross his other designs, and had even brought himself, against his nature, to a habit of neglect, and even of rudeness, towards the Queen. And it was universally known, that during his life, the Queen never had any credit with the King, in reference to any public affairs." Now, in quoting, as Neal has done, from Lord Clarendon, it did not become him, as a candid writer, to suppress those facts as related by the very authority to whom he refers, and to set down his own sectarian notions, as the real state of the case.

But let us turn our attention to the proceedings of this Parliament. It will be remembered that

Montague, who had signalized himself by his opposition to the Papists, had written and published a book, entitled, "A new Gag for an old Goose," in answer to the effusion of the Papists, entitled, "A Gag for the new Gospel." Montague had given great offence to the Puritans by his Arminian tenets, as they were called, though, to use the language of Dr. Heylin, "the entitling of these doctrines to the name of Arminius, seems to be like the nominating of the great Western Continent by the name of America, of which first Christopher Columbus, and afterwards the two Cabots, father and son, had made many notable and great discoveries, before Americus Vespusius ever saw those shores." But be this as it may, so cunning were the Puritans, that Arminianism was invariably coupled with Popery, although, as I shall immediately shew, it has actually much less connexion with the Romish Church than Calvinism. Montague was, however, cited by the Commons to appear before them, being more especially enraged against him, because he had still farther exposed the Puritan fanaticism in a work entitled "Appello Cæsarem," intended to have been dedicated to King James, but, on account of that monarch's death, inscribed to Charles [1]. Holding Calvin's doctrines

[1] Various writers entered the lists against Montague, some of them connected with the Doctrinal Puritans in the Church. Although the three Bishops petitioned Buckingham in his behalf, it is not improbable that the King would have taken no notice of the affair, but left the polemics to settle it as they

in greater reverence than the Scriptures, and the decrees of the Synod of Dort as far transcending the decisions of the First General Councils, and of the Church of England; the Puritans so far effected their purpose against Montague, that he was condemned to find sureties for the sum of two thousand pounds till the next meeting of Parliament.

Here, indeed, was a most edifying procedure;—A Committee of the House of Commons sitting as theological judges, and visiting a man with that heavy penalty, merely because he had not vindi-

pleased, had not the intolerable conduct of the Calvinists rendered it necessary to restrain their zeal. On this occasion Laud has remarked, "I seem to see a cloud threatening the Church of England. God in his mercy dissipate it." The fears of this wise prelate were but too well founded. "In this and the next year," says Fuller, the Church historian, lib. xi. p. 108, 109, "many books, from persons of several abilities and professions, were written against Mr. Montague, by Dr. Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, one who was *miles emeritus*, age giving him a *supersedeas*, save that his zeal would employ itself; and some conceived that his choler became his old age. Mr. Henry Burton, Rector of St. Matthew's, Friday-street, London, who then began to be well (as afterwards too well) known to the world. Mr. Francis Rouse, a layman by profession. Mr. Yates, a minister of Norfolk, formerly a Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; he entitles his book *Ibis ad Cæsarem*. Dr. Carleton, Bishop of Chichester. Antony Wotton, Professor of Divinity in Gresham College. In this array of writers, the strength is conceived to consist in the rear, and that the last wrote the solidest compositions. Of these six, Dean Sutcliffe is said to have chid heartily, Mr. Rouse meant honestly, Mr. Burton wrote plainly, Bishop Carleton very piously, Mr. Yates learnedly, and Mr. Wotton most solidly."

cated the extravagances of Puritanism, and set forth the tenets of Calvin. Fortunately, Laud was keeping a watchful eye on their conduct, and, after the sentence, knowing well that such intolerable conduct would prove destructive to the influence and office of the clergy, he, with the Bishops of Rochester and Oxford, dispatched a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, entreating him to engage the King to take the subject into his own hands. "The opinions," they allege, "that at this time trouble many men in the late book of Mr. Montague's, are some of them such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England, and those he is bound to maintain. Some of them are such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for learned men to expound in their own sense, so they keep themselves peaceable, and distract not the Church. And, therefore, to make any man subscribe to school opinions, may seem justly hard on the Church of Christ, and was one great fault of the Council of Trent." They then declare that these matters should duly be decided in the Convocation, with the King's licence, not in the Parliament; for, "if any other judge be allowed in matters of doctrine, we shall depart from the ordinance of Christ, and the continual course and practice of the Church."

This remonstrance, through the influence of the Duke, had the desired effect; the King revoked the proceedings of the Parliament, and declared that he himself would adopt measures to investigate

the conduct of his own chaplain. This information was given on the 9th of July [1], and on the 11th the Parliament was prorogued to meet at Oxford, on the first day of August; it being thought safer to convene it in that city than in Westminster, on account of the prevalence of a pestilential disease.

The Parliament assembled at Oxford, but it was dissolved after sitting twelve days, and Charles had a bitter experience of the folly of depending upon enthusiasts. It is impossible to reflect on the conduct of this first parliament of Charles, the majority of which was Puritanical, without viewing it with feelings of indignation. In fact, it too plainly indicated its daring intentions. The King wanted money, he had broken with Spain, and entered into a war to please those religious zealots; but how could he support it, far less preserve his own dignity in the eyes of continental Europe, without the most liberal subsidies? And they were by no means so ignorant of public affairs as not to know, that James had left an exhausted treasury,—that indeed throughout his reign that monarch had been kept in continual poverty,—and that, as good and loyal subjects, it was their duty to rally round the person of their young sovereign, and enable him to rescue the name of Britain from that degradation into which they alleged it had sunk by the peaceful administration of his father. But they had contrived to get the King into their power, and, like

[1] Laud's Diary, p 20.

skilful hunters, they were resolved he should not escape from their toils. The ancient revenues of the English crown, which had filled the coffers of Henry VII. and his successor, had, by this time, become either completely alienated, or were unproductive, and were unable, as James well knew, to support the necessary splendour of the Court, to defray the expences of the government, or to preserve that dignity which it was necessary to maintain in the eyes of foreign nations. And preceding parliaments had done this. They had by degrees encroached upon the crown, and at length had bereft it of almost all its feudal emoluments; and now, when subsidies were demanded, instead of affording them, they commenced upon their usual theme, the royal prerogative; and, notwithstanding all Charles' concessions, continually demanded from him some new compensation. The leaven of republicanism, derived from its great sources, Holland and Geneva, had gradually spread among the people: the Puritans in the Church, and the Puritans out of the Church, had contemplated it with rapturous enthusiasm; and as they had long secretly aimed at the fall of the Church, they rejoiced that they had successfully placed those models before the eyes of the people. The Calvinists, with that thirst for novelty which is the natural offspring of their tenets, were incessantly employing themselves about changes in religion, and as they held a peculiar tenet respecting what they called the kingship of Christ in his Church, they connected this dogma

with their political notions, and consequently became insolent and contemptuous towards the civil government. They had taught their adherents, especially those among the populace, that whatever they could wrest from the authority of the King was a glorious achievement; if some paused before they credited their opinions, a hint about the royal prerogative excited their fanaticism; and what was it to those zealots, though they laid prostrate the monarchy, if, under the pretence of religion, their enthusiasm acquired the ascendancy? They knew that Charles wished to aid his brother-in-law, the Elector, who had been deprived of his dominions, and driven into exile; natural affection prompted the King to this measure, and, above all, a regard for the Protestant interest in Germany, which might in its ruin overwhelm Europe with calamities. And yet, such was the inconsistency of the Calvinistic faction, that though they had violently condemned James for not at once supporting the Elector, nevertheless, when the political state of Europe assumed a new aspect, they would not enable his successor to take a single step towards his own security.

But it was the grand feature of the Calvinistic faction, and of all those who opposed the Church, to undermine the royal power by pretended suspicions of the King's sincerity in religion; by complaining of grievances which were alleged to have resulted from the abuse of the royal prerogative; and by refusing the necessary supplies, till the most extravagant and unconstitutional demands were

granted. Buckingham was indeed the minister, but of what avail was his impeachment, since it was evident, that, obnoxious as he was to them, his removal could not in the least affect Charles' situation? The King, therefore, acted in the issue as he was compelled to do, and nothing saved him from being overwhelmed by the difficulties those zealots were industriously creating, but the sudden dissolution of the Parliament. And the conduct of its members evidently proves, that they were not disinterested patriots, sober, and enlightened, but factious malcontents, who, under the pretence of religion, resolved to disturb the commonwealth. Not a single excuse can be assigned for their baseness. They well knew that they were secure in themselves; that the existing laws completely protected them from any arbitrary encroachments; that they had the sole power of relieving and controling the King's pecuniary necessities; that they had a legislative authority, and consequently had sufficient influence to procure redress. But the King had a voice in the legislation as well as they, and if *his* power was not to be exercised, what necessity was there for a monarchy at all? Charles, by his eagerness to call a Parliament, had given a most convincing proof of his desire for a parliamentary government; and nothing but their own base malice could encourage the insinuation, that, like his father, he disliked the business of the Lower House. He met his first Parliament, not doubting that the members would supply his necessities, though their conduct in the

latter years of his father's reign might have made his expectations less sanguine. But the ignorance, malice, bitter selfishness, factious ambition, and wretched enthusiasm of the Calvinists in this Parliament disappointed his hopes, and frustrated his generous intentions; and they are to be charged with all the guilt, and misery, and bloodshed, which characterise this most disastrous reign. Nor could Charles be condemned, although the allegation against him were true, that he was, in after life, averse to parliamentary government. He saw the Puritan faction in every succeeding Parliament increase, and he recollected their conduct when first he met them. He beheld them determined to adopt the republicanism of Holland, and it was his duty to defeat their treachery; he was not ignorant of the dark practices of the Scottish Presbyterians, who, in their desire to secure to themselves a power as tyrannical as that of Rome, trampled on the laws of the nation, and spurned with fanatical disdain the calmness of prudent investigation[1].

After the dissolution of Parliament, we find Laud employing himself in making a visitation of his

[1] I have formerly animadverted on the phrase, "No bishop, no king." It is proper to observe, however, that the episcopal government is more agreeable to the spirit of monarchy than any other; and James can be justified in his remark, although there were no arguments adduced as to the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy. Presbyterianism is irreverent and republican in its form; and it must be recollected, that it was, in that age, like civil republicanism, *a new invention*.

diocese of St. David's, on which occasion he consecrated the chapel which he had built at Aberguilly, on his promotion to the See[1]. About the middle of winter the Bishop returned to London, and on his arrival at Court he found no slight alteration. Bishop Williams had, by the intrigues of Buckingham, been deprived of the Great Seal, which was given to the Attorney General, Sir Thomas Coventry[2]. Williams, thus deprived of this important office, speedily declined in the favour of the King, while he found his rival, towards whom he most unjustly cherished a secret enmity, as rapidly rising in the royal confidence.

At this time, too, and this is a fact which still farther proves the falsity of the Puritan historian, the King issued a proclamation, rigidly enforcing all laws against the Popish recusants, which he commanded to be published at Reading, where the assizes were then held; and he also caused two letters to be addressed to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, signifying to them, "that no good means be neglected on their part for discovering, finding out, and apprehending of mercenary priests and Jesuits, and other seducers of the people to the Romish religion;" and also, on the other hand, he enjoined the two Primates to observe "that a vigilant care be taken with the rest of the clergy, for the repressing of those who, being ill-affected to the true religion here established, keep more close and

[1] Diary, p. 22, 23. [2] Ibid. p. 24.

secret their ill and dangerous affections that way, and, as well by their example, as by their secret and underhand contrivances, do much encourage and increase the growth of Popery and superstition in different parts of this kingdom [1]."

The Archbishop of York, in obedience to the royal proclamation, sent letters to the suffragans of his province, making known to them the sentiments of the King, and commanding them to instruct their clergy diligently, to restrain and counteract the designs of the Jesuits and their emissaries, and also to be no less watchful of the Puritans, who were as indefatigable as the Papists in their endeavours to subvert the Reformed Church, or, at least, to model it according to their own notions in polity and doctrine. But Abbot, who had more than once presumed to dispute the royal mandate, acted according to his usual custom. He had no objection to persecute the Papists, on the contrary, he would have heartily rejoiced to have beheld them extirpated with fire and sword; and such, indeed, was the very spirit of the zealots whom he patronised, who, in their unsufferable pretensions to purity, their arrogant pretensions to exclusive supremacy, and their firm devotion to the doctrines of Geneva, did not yield in the slightest degree to the Papal power. He accordingly issued letters to the suffragans of his province, of whom Laud was one, in which he rigidly

[1] Heylin, p. 134.

enforced the King's command, so far as the recusants were concerned, but he took no notice of the other part of the royal proclamation, which bore against the Puritan extravagances. The motives of his conduct in this respect were sufficiently obvious, for, if he had done his duty, and enforced a vigilant cognizance of men who were as dogmatical and superstitious in their own way as the Papists, he would have acted contrary to that policy which he had unfortunately adopted during a primacy so disastrous to the Church. Moreover, he knew well that Laud, whom he still regarded with enmity, would be mortified that he could have no authority to proceed against those whom he had invariably opposed, inasmuch as he was his suffragan, and amenable to him, if he disputed his commands. But Laud, though he would have been justified in acting upon the King's proclamation to the very letter, resolved to fulfil Abbot's injunctions, and accordingly, on receiving them, he directed the ecclesiastical officers of his diocese to make diligent search after all Popish recusants, and those who were ill-affected towards the Protestant religion, that proceedings might be instituted against them to excommunication, according to law, "and that there be a true list and catalogue of all such as have been presented and proceeded against, sent to him yearly after Easter, to be by him presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as had been required." No commands, however, were given about the Puritans, which can easily be accounted for when we

consider the nature of Abbot's letter. The Chancellor of St. David's was diligent in the duty imposed on him, and in the month of June a list of Popish recusants in the diocese was transmitted to the Bishop. The same was done in all the other dioceses[1].

About this time we find Laud indefatigable in his episcopal exertions, preaching in various places, and giving the most ample demonstrations of his regard for religion and the Church, by refusing to ordain any one whom he found to be unqualified for the sacred office[2]. But the day of Charles' coronation was now approaching, and the necessary preparations were made, in which Laud assisted, for the celebration of that splendid and solemn ceremony. On the 4th of January, 1625-6, he was appointed by the King to preach the sermon at the opening of the Parliament on the 6th of February ensuing; but a much greater mark of the royal favour was in reserve for him, as a reward of his faithful services. Bishop Williams, on account of his disgrace, had retired from Court, and the King, who seems to have been greatly displeased with him, intimated to Laud, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, that he was to supply his place at the coronation, as Dean of Westminster[3]. This was a sufficient indication to Williams that his influence was at an end, more especially as the attendance of the Deans of Westminster is indispensable at

[1] Heylin, p. 135. [2] Diary, p. 23, 24. [3] Ibid. p. 26.

that solemnity. As successors of the ancient abbots of that venerable and magnificent foundation, as keepers of the regalia and guardians of those sacred relics connected with the ancient monarchy of Britain, it belongs to them, in right of their exalted dignity, to officiate with the Primate in his solemn and important duties. The Dean, on receiving the King's commands, was at a loss how to act. He could not dispute them, because Charles had signified that he was to appoint one of the prebends to supply his place, which, had the King not done so, but appointed another ecclesiastic, unconnected with the Abbey, would have been an encroachment on the privileges of the Chapter. Of course, the Bishop had no inclination to nominate Laud, whom he unjustly considered as his enemy and his rival, and to whom he more unjustly ascribed his disgrace at Court; but, unfortunately for him, Laud was the only one of the prebends who had been raised to the episcopate, and, consequently, he could not, from his situation, be supplanted by those of inferior degree. The Dean, therefore, declined nominating any one in particular, but transmitted a list of all the prebends, with their respective stations, to the Court, and left it to the King to choose whom he pleased. Laud was at once appointed, without any efforts of his own, and, on the 17th of January, Bishop Williams ratified the appointment, by formally deputing him to supply his place as Dean of Westminster.

As it was Laud's duty to superintend the regalia,

there is one thing here which must not be passed over in silence, more especially as his enemies afterwards improved it to their own advantage. While he was giving directions respecting the crown, sword, sceptre, &c. previous to the solemnity, he discovered an old silver crucifix, which formed part of the regalia, and he ordered it to be placed, as is wont, upon the altar. The cry of Popery was instantly raised, and his enemies magnified this simple act as if it would inevitably call down the judgment of Heaven upon the whole nation. The clamour has been repeated in more recent times; and because the Bishop placed this appendage of the regalia *upon the altar*, it has been held as conclusive to prove the badness of his heart[1]. Now, I need scarcely stop to mention, that with respect to a mere crucifix, there can be no harm, though there were one in every church in the kingdom. For what is a

[1] This fact is on the authority of Heylin, p. 144, and I have adopted it, as it is a matter of very little consequence, whether or not Laud found the crucifix and ordered it to be set up, though his enemies made the most of it at his trial. It is proper, however, to mention, that the Bishop denies the affair, or at least treats it with indifference. I give his own words. "They say, there was a crucifix among the regalia, and that it stood upon the altar at the coronation, and that I did not except against it. My predecessor (Abbot) executed at that time, *and I believe would have excepted against the crucifix had it stood there. But I remember not any there.* Yet if there were, if my predecessor approved the standing of it, or were content to connive at it, it would have been made but a scorn had I quarrelled at it."—History of Troubles and Trials, p. 318.

crucifix but a mere cross, and who in those days, as in our own, Papists always excepted, believed that there was any virtue in the materials of which it might have been constructed? The Church of England permits this sign over many of the communion tables, not that its members believe, any more than the sturdiest sectarian, that it is of essential consequence, or that it can in any way add to the sanctity of the Christian temple, but merely as an emblem, in which every man ought to glory, as significant of, and fit at all times to call to his remembrance the price paid for, his redemption. There must, from the very nature of the human mind, be some external means to awaken mental association; and the error consists not in the adoption or the practice of any ceremony or sign in religion, but in superstitiously assigning a virtue to it, which it cannot possess. If, in worldly practice, men depict their family treasures with their armorial bearings, their crests, and their peculiar distinctions, ought a Christian to be indignant when he beholds the badge of his salvation, which, above all things, is so calculated to remind him of the sufferings of Him who endured a shameful and a painful death, that all men, if they repent, might be made partakers of the life immortal? Let it be observed, too, that I am talking of religious rites, of those solemn occasions when men of every degree bow before the throne of grace, and confess that they are miserable sinners, and present their prayers not to the inanimate objects around them, but to Him who is

every where present, and more peculiarly so in his holy temples. Concerning the Papists, their superstitious delusions in the homage which they render to the sign of the cross, are to be avoided as fearfully dangerous; nor need I remind the reader of the impostures they practised on men during the prevalence of their superstition. But it is one thing to admit the sign of the cross, and another thing to worship it, or to address to it prayers and supplications. And here let us pause, and see whether the extravagances of the Puritans, as to this harmless sign, proceeded not too far. While the more rational and the more learned of the Reformers rightly imagined, that they were to carry on the warfare not so much against the Church, as against the gross doctrines and the scandalous lives of the clergy, the more violent, and especially those who had departed from Rome to the other extreme at Geneva, embarked in a crusade against every thing which seemed an encroachment on their strange ideas of simplicity and spirituality. Accordingly, in some places on the continent, and more especially in Scotland, the zealots of which country were afterwards faithfully imitated by the sectarian fanatics who overturned the constitution to gratify Cromwell's hypocritical ambition, they made the most wanton attacks on the churches and the property of ecclesiastics, burning and destroying books, pictures, and other ancient remains; with fanatical fury pulling down buildings, and stalking with gloomy pride and savage exultation over the vene-

rable ruins, merely because they had this inoffensive sign, as if the very stone walls had been contaminated. Nothing could stop the "pitiful devastation[1]" of those phrenzied assailants, until they practised to the very letter the deplorable language of one of their most ferocious leaders, "Down with the nests, and the rooks will fly away[2]." What, then, can be said of such deplorable enthusiasm, but this, that when men break loose from the salutary restraints of civil society, and contend not for a reformation only, but for the mastery, they mistake the impulses of their passions for the dictates of religion, and they glory in the gratification of principles which are not less dangerously superstitious than those against which they contend? And hence it is, that because some men act not so outrageously as themselves, they feed their disappointment and revenge by false insinuations, which they are conscious are not only false, but the mere dictates of their own imaginations.

On the 2d of February, 1625-6, Charles I. was crowned. Archbishop Abbot, in virtue of his office, placed the crown upon the King's head, though the Primate was hardly able to officiate, from the state of his health. Laud performed his duty as Dean of Westminster on this solemn occasion. Dr. Senhouse, who had been the King's chaplain when Prince of Wales, and now Bishop of Carlisle,

[1] Spottiswoode's Church of Scotland, p. 175.

[2] John Knox, Bishop Keith's History, folio.

preached the coronation sermon, from Rev. xi. 10. "I will give thee a crown of life,"—a remarkable text, when we consider the death of this Monarch, —and the sermon being chiefly on the vanity of all earthly things, it was subsequently recollected by many as strangely presaging the melancholy disasters of this reign. The coronation oath was demanded by the Primate, and, after the solemnity was ended, the ensigns of royalty were delivered to Laud, as *pro tempore* Dean of the Abbey[1].

Laud, however, has not escaped censure on account of the share he sustained in the solemnities of the coronation. His Puritan enemies, because he was at this time in favour with the King, have charged him with altering the coronation oath, and making it very different from that which ought to have been taken. Now, when we reflect on the impossibility of this, even admitting that Laud entertained such a design, we shall at once see the falseness of this charge. Abbot was Primate, the acknowledged head of the Calvinists, and the patron of the Puritans; it was his duty to attend to this important affair, and, in fact, he was alone accountable for it, if there had been any alteration. He and Laud had no intercourse with each other, they had been at decided variance from the very first, and it is not to be imagined for a moment, that Abbot was so ignorant or so careless as to permit such an alteration. And had it been so,

[1] Fuller's Church History, lib. xi. p. 121—124.

was he the man to keep silence on the subject? We have seen him exerting himself on other occasions of less importance, and when, by his conduct, he was actually undermining the Church, was it at all likely that he would be listless on an occasion which involved the safety of the Protestant religion? He was too furious against the Papists in his own way, not to render any encouragement to them hopeless; and besides, from the opinion which he chose to entertain of Laud, he would be more cautious of him than of any other, though he well knew that Laud was not more friendly to the Papists than himself. It seems clear, were there no other proof, from the very circumstance of Abbot being Primate at the time, that the coronation oath was not altered in a single phrase.

But, without commenting on Charles' known hostility to the Papists, which he especially manifested in his Instructions to the Archbishops, Dec. 15,—on the rashness of the subject who would presume to alter an oath, which, had he done so, might have brought him to the block—on the fact, that the Puritans, ever endeavouring to pry into these subjects, said nothing about it at the time,—and on the notorious truth, that it was a mere calumny, invented afterwards by Laud's enemies, to promote their own designs, and as a pretence for covering their atrocities, we shall form a correct estimate of the nature of this invidious charge from the facts of the case. First, then, let us observe the oath said to have been taken by Charles, with the ancient form

of the coronation oath in the reign of Edward II. which is the most ancient in print; and, secondly, let us observe the charges against Laud, and by whom they are advanced.

"Sir, (said the Archbishop to Charles) will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm, to the people of England, the laws and customs to them granted by the Kings of England, your lawful and religious predecessors, and namely, the laws, customs, and practices, granted to the clergy by the glorious King St. Edward, your predecessor, according to the laws of God, the true profession of the gospel established in this kingdom, agreeable to the prerogative of the Kings thereof, and the ancient customs of this realm?—Will you keep peace and godly agreement, according to your power, both to God, the holy Church, the clergy, and the people?—Will you, to your power, cause law, justice, and discretion, to mercy and truth, to be executed to your judgment?—Will you grant to hold and keep the laws and rightful customs which the commonalty of this your kingdom have, and will you defend and uphold them to the honour of God, so much as in you lieth[1]?"

Such is the oath sworn by Charles I. to every clause of which he expressed his solemn affirmative. Now, the oath of Edward II. the most ancient, as I have stated, on record, is exactly the same, with

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 200, 201. Heylin, p. 146, 147.

this difference only, that the first article ends at the words "St. Edward your predecessor," whereas in the oath of Charles, those clauses were added beginning with "according to the laws of God," to "the ancient customs of this realm[1]." After the end of the fourth article of Charles' oath, one of the Bishops read this passage to the King: "Our Lord and King, we beseech you to pardon and to grant, and to preserve unto us, and to the churches committed to your charge, all canonical privileges, and do law and justice, and that you would protect and defend us, as every good King in his kingdoms ought to be the protector and defender of the Bishops and churches under their government." The King then declared and promised that he would do so "with a willing and devout heart," after which, being led to the communion table, he took the oath in presence of the people, by laying his hand upon the Bible, and saying, "The things which I have here promised, I shall perform and keep, So help me God, and the contents of this book." After which, when conducted back to the throne, the following passage was read to him, "Stand and hold fast from henceforth the place to which you have been heir by the succession of your forefathers, being now delivered to you by the authority of Almighty God, and by the hands of us, and all the Bishops and servants of God.

[1] Rymer's Acta Regia, vol. iii. p. 63. Rapin, edit. 1732, folio, vol. i. p. 389.

And as you see the clergy to come nearer to the altar than others, so remember that (in all places convenient) you give them greater honour, that the Mediator of God and man may establish you in the kingly throne, to be a mediator betwixt the clergy and the laity, and that you may reign for ever with Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords[1]."

But when we reflect that this calumny against Charles and Laud was circulated seventeen years after the coronation, by those enthusiasts to whom the King pleaded his coronation oath for not yielding to their extravagances, we at once perceive the real source, and the occasion of the charge. In Charles' Answer, cited in the note[2], he thus expresses himself: "We say, with a clear and upright conscience to Almighty God, whosoever harbours the least thought in his heart of ruining or violating the public liberty or religion of this kingdom, or the just freedom and privilege of Parliament, *let him be accursed;* and he shall be no counsellor of ours who will not say, Amen." But those zealots, finding that they could not justify themselves, unless they could establish a case, scrupled not to declare, in the face of truth and honesty, that the coronation

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. "His Majestie's Answer to a printed book, entituled a Remonstrance, or, the Declaration of the Lords and Commons now assembled in Parliament, May 26, 1642. London, printed by Robert Barker, printer to the King's most excellent Majestie, 1642, p. 16, 17.

[2] Ibid. p. 5.

oath had been violated, and that it had been intentionally done by the King, to justify what they called his arbitrary power. It may be here necessary to remark, that in the Parliament of 1642, when this charge was first made, the factious members of it were endeavouring to compel the King to give his assent to whatever bills they thought proper; and because they met with a refusal, they asserted that he was bound by the coronation oath to act as they requested. Such was the conduct of men, who, we are told repeatedly, were the defenders of the constitution. But is it not most evident, that the absurd *argumentum* of those fanatical politicians was just the very reverse, and that the King was labouring to uphold that constitution which they were assiduously endeavouring to overthrow? For if Charles, or any English monarch, had so acted, where would have been his share in the legislature? He became at once a tool in the hands of Parliament; his authority was less than nominal; and, in effect, the monarchy was sapped at its very foundations. Those sages, moreover, champions of liberty as the modern liberals pretend they were, arrogated to themselves, and exercised a power, which they denied to the King, who, in his own person, was the third of the legislating estates of the kingdom. Their conduct would not be tolerated at the present moment; for it is an essential part of the British constitution, that the King can refuse to sign any bill which may be presented to him, putting his negative upon it, in the same

manner as the two Houses of Parliament; and if the King has not this power, which he can exercise when he pleases, then he is divested of his share in the government, and his authority is merely nominal; he becomes a tool in the hands of Parliament, and the independence of the monarchy is annihilated.

It is to be observed, too, that the alteration, if it may be called so, was not made in the reign of Charles, but in that of James, and could not be charged on Bishop Laud [1]. And it is, therefore, evident, from the preceding references, that there was no alteration of the oath, and that it was only alleged by a faction, who were eventually too successful in their machinations; but who, at that period, could not prevail on the King to act as unconstitutionally as themselves.

Let us now notice the second particular, namely, what is alleged against Laud on this subject, and by whom. At a subsequent period of the Bishop's life, his enemies—those who constituted themselves his judges—asserted that he had altered the oath. The individuals who made this charge were his old antagonists the Puritans, and hence their assertion must be received with caution, for, as has been already said, Abbot, who had on former occasions shewn himself sufficiently officious in minor con-

[1] Husband's Collections, 4to. London edit. vol. i. p. 263. 706. Rapin's History of England, vol. ii. folio edit. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 146, 147. Laud's Troubles and Trials, p. 318, 319, 320. 354, &c.

cerns, would not be inclined to allow what most materially affected the constitution to pass unnoticed[1]. Laud is charged by one, with having "altered the old coronation oath, and framed another *new one*[2];" by a second, with having "purposely emasculated it[3];" by a third, the fanatical Prynne, who was, let it be noted, his most inveterate enemy, with having inserted the phrase, "agreeable to the King's prerogative," and caused the other phrase to be omitted, "which the people have chosen, or shall choose[4]." And, many years after his death, another individual alleged that the Bishop had delated from the ancient coronation oath the phrases, "that the King should consent to *such laws as the people should choose,*" and had inserted instead thereof, "saving the King's prerogative royal[5]." This individual takes Prynne as his authority. Such are the jarring assertions of Laud's enemies.

Now, it may be here remarked, that there is no evidence that the words which Laud is accused of having struck out were *at any time* a part of the

[1] In the Narrative, drawn up by Abbot himself, in which he bitterly declaims against Laud, there is not a single insinuation respecting the coronation oath. If it had been altered by Laud, Abbot would gladly have availed himself of the fact. Rushworth, Abbot's Narrative, vol. i.

[2] William Lilly's True History of Charles I. 12mo. London, 1715, p. 21.

[3] Life of King Charles, by an anonymous writer, p. 30.

[4] Canterburie's Doome, p. 318, 319. Wharton's Diary.

[5] Lord Chief Baron Atkins' Speech to the Lord Mayor of London, October, 1693.

ancient oath; but it is indisputable, that the original could not possibly infer the same meaning which was extracted from them by the Puritan politicians. For if the King was "to consent to *such laws as the people should choose*," how could he be said to govern the kingdom, seeing that he was virtually under the control of men who could compel him to do what they pleased? Who were the people? Unquestionably those who sat in the House of Commons were not elected by public opinion, but by popular clamour; and as the majority of them were religious enthusiasts, it was impossible that they could legislate with justice and moderation. This fact, therefore, must be kept in view; for it is one thing to act according to the constitution, and another thing to be misled by outrageous enthusiasm. The Puritans had taken especial care to inflame the minds of the people, whom they contrived to render subservient to their designs, by filling them with visionary fears about Popery, and by studiously misrepresenting the actions of the Court. But granting that the oath was altered as alleged, though the coronation oath can only be altered by the Parliament, still the alteration was not unconstitutional, because it is the grand prerogative of the British monarch to refuse assent to any laws passed by the people, represented by the Commons; and much more can he refuse assent to any laws, which the people, from their mere caprice, may desire. There could be no greater absurdity than to assert that the King must yield to *every demand;* that he must

consent to *every* proposed law, whether wise or not; that he must become completely under the control of circumstances. Should *the people* be moderate and enlightened, so far well; but if they should be fanatical and seditious, must he still submit? There is something worse than ridiculous even in the very idea, that the King must consent to *whatever laws* the people shall choose; and were it practised, there would be no longer a well-regulated state, but one of confusion and rebellion. It conduces to the very safety and dignity of a free nation, that the King should be independent in his own person, otherwise he cannot administer the laws, act as the protector of his subjects, and as the head of the state. But to say that a Prince is to be *subject* to *the people*, to consent to whatever they please, however absurd and extravagant, and to be denied the exercise of the royal prerogative, is to exalt to power the worst of all factions, and to place the public administration in the hands of the populace, which is the very worst species of tyranny. The absurdity of those zealots is apparent; and the reader has only to recollect the conduct of those pretended champions of liberty, when, by their successful hypocrisy and rebellion, they had succeeded in overthrowing the constitution both in Church and State. The spirit of Puritanism is always the same; it is actuated by mean and selfish jealousies; it wishes to prevail, and spurns the restraints of law and justice. In its conventicle system, it openly vindicates sedition. The spirit which

operated at this time was the very same as that which, when first imported from Geneva, stimulated John Knox and his adherents to subscribe a solemn covenant, shortly after the Scottish Parliament of 1560, that they would take up arms against the government, and make common cause, if even *one* of their brethren chose to think himself aggrieved [1].

But the truth is, that Laud's Puritan enemies wilfully misrepresented him, and determined to make this charge against him, in addition to their other falsehoods, to vindicate their own treason and dark practices [2]. Laud himself completely

[1] Knox's History. Spottiswoode's History.

[2] Husband's (Edward) Collections, 4to. p. 706. In one of the Remonstrances which passed between the King and the Parliament concerning the coronation oath, there is this passage.—"That the oath hath been ordinarily so taken appears by a memorandum upon record at the coronation of Richard II. wherein the heads of the oath being set down, that clause of the oath concerning the King's strengthening such laws as the people *have chosen* or *shall choose*, (the matter is not great whether way it be rendered, so it bee understood alwayes that the lawes refer in that clause to the *royall assent*, as a thing *future*, and not *past*, as they doe,) is rendered thus: '*Ac de faciendo per ipsum Dominum Regem eos esse protegendos, et ad honorem Dei, corroborandum quos vulgus juste et rationabiliter eligerit*,' which expression, with that qualification, *which the people should justly and reasonably choose*, clearly relates to *new laws* that should be chosen by the people; and in all the alterations in the forme of the oath that we can find, excepting that it was taken by his Majesty, and his father, King James, (wherein the word *choose* is wholly left out, as well *hath chosen*, as *will choose*) that clause is understood of *new laws to be made*, as in that oath which Henry VIII.

refutes the charge, and it is fair that his remarks should be here inserted. When he was charged with the two alterations in the coronation oath, "one added," says he, "namely, these words, 'agreeable to the King's prerogative.' The other omitted these words, *Quæ populus elegerit, which the people have chosen* or *shall choose.* For this latter, the clause omitted, that suddenly vanished, for it was omitted in the oath of King James, as is confessed by themselves in the printed votes of this present Parliament, (p. 706). But the other insisted on, *as taking off the total assurance*

corrected and interlined with his own hand, (whereof there is a copy among the Memorials of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth,) the clause in question, that is, 'and affirm them which the folk and people hath made and chosen,' is interlined by him thus, instead of *folk*, he puts *nobles and people*, and after the words *made and chosen*, he added *with my consent.* And in the oath of Edward VI., which is to be seen at Lambeth also, the Lords Protectors and the other co-executors holding it necessary to correct the ceremonies and observances used at the coronation of the King of this realme, in respect of the tedious length of the same, and also because they conceived, that many points of the same were such as, by the laws of this realm at that present, were not allowable (as is there expressed), they altered several clauses in the oath, and the clause in question they changed into this following, 'Do you grant to make no new laws, but such as shall be to the honour and glory of God, and to the good of the commonwealth, and that the same shall be made by the consent of your people, as hath been accustomed?' By all which it clearly appears, that in that clause of the oath, *Et ad honorem Dei corroborandum quos vulgus eligerit*, his Majesty's royal assent to *new laws* was generally understood to be meant." Husband, ut supr.

which the subjects have by the oath of their prince, for the performance of his laws. First, I humbly conceive, that this clause takes off none of the people's assurance; none at all. For the King's just and regal prerogative, and the subjects' assurance for liberty and property, may stand well together, and have stood so for hundreds of years. Secondly, that alteration, whatever it may be, was not made by me, nor is there any interlining or alteration so much as of a letter found in that book. Thirdly, if any thing be amiss therein, my predecessor gave that oath to the King, and not I. I was merely ministerial, both in the preparation and at the coronation itself, supplying the place of the Dean of Westminster[1]."

[1] Troubles and Trials, &c. p. 318, 319, 320, 324, 354, 355. The proceedings of the Puritan politicians are remarkable in this affair. Their allegations against the Bishop are the merest quibbles, and though they had the most certain evidence that the charge was false, they betook themselves to miserable subterfuges in straining the meaning of words. For example, they rested an argument on finding the word *perform*, instead of *confirm;* and in another part, where the King answered *I will*, instead of *I do*. Laud's remarks on the arguments of his enemies are admirable, and evince the generous indignation which he must have felt when the Puritans, by their sophistry, endeavoured to represent him as being the enemy of his country. It is no less surprising, too, that they themselves admitted that the oath had not been altered from the same taken by James, and it was evident that, if there had been any alteration, Abbot, the Primate, was the guilty person, inasmuch as he proposed the oath to the King, in virtue of his office. The accusation,

Four days after Charles' coronation the second Parliament assembled; and on Monday, the 6th of February, Laud preached the opening sermon before the King and the House of Lords[1], from the 3d, 4th, and 5th verses of the 112th Psalm. In his discourse he took a masterly view of the Jewish hierarchy, considering it, in its political order, concord, and unity, as the great type of the Christian Church, with this difference, that the Church of the Jews was political and ecclesiastical, whereas the Christian Church is solely a spiritual kingdom. He then strikingly pourtrayed the danger of faction to the well-being of the state, whether political or ecclesiastical. Unity, he declared, was the strength of both. "Would you keep the state in unity?" he asks, "in any case take heed of breaking the peace of the Church. The peace of the state depends much upon it: for, divide Christ in the minds of men, or divide the minds of men about their hopes of salvation in Christ, and then tell me where will be the unity[2]?" The wisdom of these sentiments is indisputable, and they are worthy of the great man by whom they were inculcated.

indeed, is most invidious, and proves the dispositions of those men of whom we are told so much about their defence of the constitution, their struggle for liberty, &c.

[1] It is the third of his printed Sermons. Diary, p. 28.

[2] Sermons, 4to. p. 107. "Feb. 26. First Sunday in Lent. I presented to his Majesty my sermon which I had preached at the opening of the Parliament before, now printed by his Majesty's command." Diary, p. 29.

But the Commons in this Parliament were as little disposed as in the former to profit by advice, and they had no sooner proceeded to business, than Montague was again called to account by them for what they called Arminianism. But, with the exception of a conference held at the Duke of Buckingham's house, by the desire of the Earl of Worcester, between Dr. Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester, and Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, on the one side, and Dr. Morton, Bishop of Litchfield, and Dr. Preston, on the other; and another conference held a few days after, in which Montague ably defended himself, he was permitted to pass unmolested[1]. He might probably, however, have experienced a different fate "if the Commons," as Dr. Heylin observes, "had not been diverted by a pursuit after the Duke of Buckingham, who, being more noble game, they laid Montague's case aside, having done nothing in it but raised a great desire in several members of both Houses to give themselves some satisfaction in these doubtful points." The usual contentions arose between the King and

[1] Committees on religion were now invariably appointed by the Parliament, and were held to be as indispensable as the baggage to an army. I imagine it will be a difficult matter to defend the conduct of those sages in this respect. It is a singular thing, too, that those committees thought themselves sufficiently qualified to decide on the most abstruse points of theology, though they were composed of men who, for the most part, knew little save their mother tongue. This, however, is quite in accordance with the Genevan polity, and no doubt was sufficiently gratifying to their enthusiasm.

the Commons on the subject of the supplies, and Buckingham's conduct was taken into their consideration. The King was at this time engaged in a war with Spain, and as he saw no symptoms of their co-operation, he wished to know what supplies they intended to grant him. He pressed upon them the fact, that unless those supplies were granted, his army would mutiny, and he himself be compelled to adopt measures unworthy of his crown[1]. But the Puritan faction were not to be convinced, or at least they had determined not to be so; for, having their own purposes in view, instead of uniting with the King in legislating for the welfare and honour of the kingdom, they resumed the conduct which they not unlikely had intended to adopt in the preceding Parliament, and accused Buckingham of high crimes and misdemeanors.

This affair chiefly originated in the Duke's general policy, and it must be admitted that there was some cause for the popular discontentment. Yet every one will allow, that this Parliament might

[1] On this occasion Clement Coke, a younger son to the famous Sir Edward Coke, is said to have remarked in the Parliament, "that it was better to die by a foreign enemy than to be destroyed at home;" and Heylin assures us, that for his conduct in this Parliament, young Coke was "severely reprimanded by his father, who could not be persuaded to look upon him for a long time after." The King's reply to this observation of Coke is worthy of notice. "I think it more honourable," said Charles, "for a king to be invaded, and almost despised by a common enemy, than to be despised at home."

have been much better employed than in first appointing a committee about religion, and that committee appointing a sub-committee, thus taking the executive government out of the hands of the King, and assuming the entire power themselves. The Duke's case was only a very small part of the business of Parliament, and yet we find every thing suspended on that account. Now, granting for a moment, which is not the fact, that, according to the shewing of one of the members, the King had lost the regality of the narrow seas since the Duke became Admiral—that he did not diligently perform the duties of his office—that he had abused the King's liberality, and squandered the revenues —that he had engrossed all the public offices, and preferred his own relations—that he had sold places of importance, and that his mother and father-in-law patronised Papists, still there was no cause why the business of Parliament should be stopped, the government, as it were, suspended, as if they were glad of an opportunity to annoy the King. It is evident, that had they not alighted on the Duke, they would have found sufficient excuses in Montague's business, and in assuming the office of theological dictators, in which they were as intolerant as any Popish Councils. On the whole, it appears, that this Parliament had resolved to adopt the same policy as the former one, which is justly chargeable, by its dark practices, as the origin of all the disasters of Charles' reign.

It is evident that the Duke was in this instance

treated unjustly, and that the faction who opposed him were not actuated by patriotic motives[1]. For, whatever truth there might have been in the articles exhibited against him, it cannot be denied that he was marked out as a victim to popular clamour. The Earl of Bristol's charges against him resulted from private hatred, and though the Commons had resolved to impeach him themselves, from a doubt of the validity of Bristol's assertion, still they cordially united in endeavouring to effect the Duke's ruin. It was in vain that the King, in his message to the House of Lords, assured those factious members of the Commons, that the Duke had acted in no capacity without his knowledge; that he had discharged his duty with zeal; and, therefore, that they should desist from their unconstitutional proceedings. The House of Commons saw, that if

[1] In confirmation of this, I add the testimony of Lord Clarendon. The noble author, in his History of the Rebellion, informs us, that "they who flattered him (the Duke) most before, mentioned him now with the greatest acrimony and bitterness: and the same men who had called him *our saviour*, for bringing the Prince safe out of Spain, called him now the corrupter of the King, and the betrayer of the liberties of the people, without the least crime imputed to him, to have been committed since the time of that exalted adulation, or that it was not then as much known to them as it could be now, *so fluctuating and unsteady a testimony is the applause of popular councils.*" I confess, however, that though the Duke was harshly treated, and though he had good reason to be disgusted with this Parliament, yet his subsequent conduct was impolitic and imprudent. Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, folio edit.

they did not act with boldness, while the King's necessities were urgent, there would be little or no prospect of success to their schemes. The King, however, was aware of them, and was resolved not to abandon a nobleman whose chief crime was, that he did not encourage the Calvinistic faction[1]. "I must put you in remembrance," said Charles to the Parliament, "of times that are past. You may remember that my father, moved by your counsel, and gained by your persuasions, broke the treaties. In these persuasions I was your instrument towards him, and I rejoiced to be instrumental in any thing conducive to the welfare of this realm. Nor was there any one in greater favour with you than this man, whom you so traducc. And now, when you find me involved in war, and having no honourable

[1] The disputes between Buckingham and his enemies, more especially the Earl of Bristol, threatened the most serious consequences. "It was very sharp," says Laud, (Diary, p. 32, April 19,) "and such as threatens ruin to one of the parties." The following annotation deserves to be inserted, as equally proving Charles' regard for religion, and his love of justice, which has endeared his memory to the Church of England. "April 22, Sunday. The King sent for all the bishops to come to him at four o'clock in the afternoon. We waited upon him, fourteen in number. Then his Majesty chid us, that at this time of Parliament we were silent on the cause of the Church, and did not make known to him what might be useful or was prejudicial to the Church, *professing himself ready to promote the cause of the Church*. He then commanded us, that in the causes of the Earl of Bristol and the Duke of Buckingham, *we should follow the direction of our own consciences, being led by proofs, not by reports*."

and safe retreat, you make my necessity your privilege, and set what rate you please upon your supplies."

Sir Dudley Digges, and Sir John Elliot, two members of the House of Commons, who were chosen to carry up the articles of impeachment to the House of Lords, were committed to the Tower, on account of some expressions which they used on that occasion[1]; and, in answer to the Earl of Bristol's charge, that the Duke had endeavoured to convert the King to the Popish Church while he was in Spain, Charles, in his message to the Lords, positively asserted that it was a falsehood, and that the Duke, to his own certain knowledge, had made no such attempt. Buckingham, in his answer to the several articles of the impeachment, defended himself with great modesty and ability; but the Commons had resolved on his ruin, and the King, finding them determined to oppose him in every measure, was at length compelled to dissolve the Parliament on the 15th of June, 1626[2].

[1] They were both released, however, soon afterwards, on explaining themselves.

[2] I quote the following from Heylin, who has inserted it from the Cabala, as an extract from a letter written to the King by a person unknown. "These men," says the writer, "either cannot or will not remember, that no nobleman in favour with his sovereign was ever questioned in Parliament, except by the King himself, in case of treason, or unless it were in the non-age and tumultuary times of Richard II. Henry VI. or Edward VI. which happened to the destruction both of king and kingdom. And not to exceed our own and our father's memory, in Henry VIII.'s

Such was the conclusion of Charles' second Parliament, and it is impossible to reflect on the conduct of its members without indignation. We perceive them, instead of taking "" counsel together," that they might preserve the kingdom in unity, and thereby increase its strength, busily engaged in fostering the spirit of faction, thwarting the measures of their Sovereign, employing themselves in appointing committees of religion, and absolutely restraining the exercise of government, to gratify their own personal prejudices. There can, I am persuaded, be only one opinion on this subject, and that is, that these men were strengthening themselves more and more to ensure the success of their faction, and to accomplish their grand design of overturning the throne, and making the Monarch a mere tool in the hands of outrageous fanatics.

It is now time to notice the part which Laud is

time, Wolsey's exorbitant power and pride, and Cromwell's contempt of the nobility and laws, were not permitted to be discussed in Parliament, though they were most odious and grievous to the kingdom. And that Leicester's undeserved favour and faults, Hatton's insufficiency, and Raleigh's insolence, far exceeded what hath yet been objected against the Duke, yet no lawyer durst abet, nor any man else begin invectives against them in Parliament." The writer then advises the King to support the Duke, "for if they prevail with this, they have hatched a thousand other demands, to pull the feathers off royalty; they will appoint him counsellors, servants, alliances, limits of his expences, accounts of his revenue, chiefly, if they can (as they mainly desire), they will now dazzle him in the beginning of his reign." Heylin, p. 144, 145.

alleged to have taken in those proceedings, as his enemies invariably thrust his name forward on every subject which they chose to oppose, and gave him the credit of their bad success. While this admission of theirs is an unconscious testimony to Laud's talents, it must not be passed over without animadversion, as we shall soon find them practising against him as industriously as they were against his patron, Buckingham. It was reported, that Laud was most active in managing the Duke's cause against the Puritan faction; and Prynne asserts, that the King's speech to the two Houses of Parliament was written by Laud: "This speech of his," (the King's), says Prynne, "was penned for him by this pragmatical bishop, the original copy whereof was given in evidence against him, under his own hand[1]." And again, concerning Buckingham's reply to the impeachment: "The Bishop, though then a member of the Upper House, and a judge of this cause, was yet such a sworn vassal to the Duke, that he penned his speech which he made to the Lords in the Upper House, against the Commons' impeachment, and corrected and amended his answer to his impeachment, as his tried advocate in sundry particulars given against him in evidence under his own hand: and likewise penned the King's speech in the House of Peers, touching the Duke, and the commitment of the Earl of Arundel, *as appears by the original draught*[2]." But these assertions are entirely

[1] Breviat, p. 7. [2] Ibid. p. 8.

gratuitous, and rest solely on the circumstance, that when, at a future time, Laud's papers were ransacked, in order that the malice of his enemies might find some gratification, written copies of both speeches, which Prynne chooses to call *original*, were found. On the shewing of this enthusiast, therefore, when a *written* copy of any document is found in a man's possession, especially if he has had any concern in the transactions mentioned therein, he must be held as the author,—an assertion quite in unison with his absurd modes of reasoning. But, granting that Laud did actually write those speeches, what charge can be made against him? He was indeed a member of the Upper House, but it did not follow that he was to coincide with all the motions of that House; and though Prynne takes care to inform us, that he was, from his situation, "a judge in this cause," thereby casting imputations upon Laud's integrity, yet he might have known, that it never was the intention of Charles' Parliaments to submit their proceedings to a candid investigation, inasmuch as they wished to be judges in their own persons. And even if Laud had written those speeches, his integrity still remains unimpeached; for he well knew, and made no secret, of the wicked designs of those men. But if Prynne meant, as he undoubtedly intended, to impugn Charles' capacity, and more deeply involve Laud in this, among other visionary and false charges brought against him, he is at once refuted by the King's well known literary acquirements, which, notwithstanding the impotent

attempts of his enemies, are happily indisputable: and, in the second place, whatever may have been the Duke's failings, and whatever his attainments, certain it is, that he was not destitute of mental accomplishments. For, when he was in the Netherlands, shortly after this period, negotiating a loan for the King's jewels, hearing that some curious Arabic Manuscripts, which had been left by Erpenius, the original collector, to his widow, and by her exposed to sale, were about to be purchased by some Jesuits, he disappointed the learned fathers, and gave for them 500*l.*; "a mixed act," says Sir Henry Wotton, "both of bounty and charity, and the more laudable, being much out of his natural element[1]." He spared no cost in the purchasing of curious coins, and his collection of pictures at York House was the admiration of the age[3]. He regarded them with all the enthusiasm of an

[1] After Buckingham's death, the Manuscripts were presented to the University of Cambridge, of which University he had been Chancellor, by the Duchess, in fulfilment of her husband's original intentions. "He had a purpose likewise," says Wotton, "as I am well informed, to place in the University, where he was Chancellor, a fair case for them, and to furnish it with other choice collections from all parts at his own charge." Sir H. Wotton's Life of the Duke of Buckingham, p. 18.

[2] Laud to Archbishop Usher. Parr's Collect. No. CLXVI.

[3] In the Queen's Staircase at Hampton Court he is introduced into a picture painted by Tintoret, one of those who had experienced the Duke's liberality, in the character of Mercury, presenting the Arts and Sciences to the King and Queen, sitting on a cloud, and some boys are represented driving away Envy and

amateur [1]. These facts do not, indeed, prove Buckingham to have been a political orator, still they are

Malice.—Sir Henry Wotton remarks, concerning the Duke, that he was in his natural element when among pictures and other productions of the fine arts.

[1] It may not be improper here to introduce a brief account of the Duke of Buckingham's collection of pictures, part of which were, during the Usurpation, sold at Antwerp by his son, to relieve his necessities. That we may form an idea of this splendid collection, the Duke at one time gave 10,000*l.* for the collection of the famous Rubens; and Sir Henry Wotton, his biographer, while ambassador at Venice, made extensive purchases for him of many admirable pictures by the first masters. In this collection there were no less than seventeen by Tintoret, twenty-one by Bassan, nineteen by Titian, thirteen by Paul Veronese, thirteen by Rubens, two by Georgioni, eight by Palma, three by Guido, three by Leonardo da Vinci, two by Correggio, and three by Raphael D'Urbino; besides others by celebrated masters, whose works are now extremely rare. After the Duke's death, some were purchased by the King, the Earl of Northumberland, and Abbot Montague; but the greater part was purchased by the Archduke Leopold of Austria, and added to the splendid collection in the Castle of Prague. The famous picture, the *Ecce Homo* of Titian, was one of those which the Archduke purchased, in which are introduced portraits of the Pope, Charles V. of Spain, and Solyman the Magnificent. This picture, eight feet in length, and twelve in breadth, was valued at 5000*l.*; but from an authentic note of the engraver, it appears that the Earl of Arundel offered the Duke in his lifetime 7000*l.* in money or land, for this single piece. There is a painting of it in Northumberland House, Strand. See the Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Collection, in 1635.

The famous window of stained glass in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, also belonged to Buckingham, and was sold by his son. Its history is somewhat remarkable. It was made by order of the magistrates of Dort, as a complimentary present for

not without weight, and there are few men, especially men of rank, who are unable, on important

Henry VII. who was then building his Chapel, and was five years in progress. But Henry died before the completion of his Chapel, and the Abbot of Waltham Abbey got possession of the window, and set it up in his church. After the death of that ecclesiastic, it was removed by the last Abbot of the Abbey, at the period of the dissolution of the monasteries, to Newhall, in Wiltshire, belonging to the Earl of Ormond, where it was deposited in a private chapel; after which it passed into the possession of Sir Thomas Boleyn, father of the famous queen, Anne Boleyn. It then came into the hands of Ratcliff, Earl of Sussex, in Elizabeth's reign; from whose family it was purchased by Buckingham. His son sold it to the celebrated General Monk. In order that it might be preserved from the violence of the sectaries during the Usurpation, Monk caused it to be concealed under ground, otherwise it would have been certainly destroyed by the Puritanical fanatics; for they were stimulated by a worse than Gothic fury against every thing which was not in accordance with their clownish and fanatical taste; their sacrilegious and caitiff hands having demolished, it is said, more than eight hundred windows of stained glass. After the Restoration, Monk placed it in his chapel at Newhall. His son and heir, the second Duke of Albemarle, died in 1686, and it devolved to the Duchess; but as she did not reside at Newhall, this famous window was exposed to injury and damage. Monk's family having sold Newhall, it came into the possession of the new purchaser, who destroyed part of the ancient mansion, and pulled down the chapel, with the exception of the window, which he left standing, hoping, it is said, that it would be purchased for some church. It lay some time cased in boxes, till a gentleman, named Conyers, purchased it; and having employed an artist, named Price, to repair it at great expense, he set it up in his chapel at Copthall, near Epping Forest. It remained there till his son built a new mansion, and having no use for it, he sold it, in 1758, for four

occasions, to defend themselves in language which is far more impressive than the most polished rhetorical effusions.

A few things remain to be noticed, connected more immediately with Bishop Laud, before I close this chapter. On the sixth of March, we find him resigning his parsonage of Ibstock, which he had held *in commendam,* but for what reason he does not assign [1]. On the 16th of that month, he records in his Diary, of " a certain Dutchman, named John Oventrout," who said, that he had discovered a mode by which the King of England might obtain possession of the Spanish colonies, and as he pretended that it depended much on religion, Laud was appointed to converse with him, along with the principal Secretary of State. He appears, however, to have been a visionary Calvinistic fanatic,

hundred guineas, to the committee appointed by Parliament for the repairing of St. Margaret's, Westminster, where it now remains. Judging from the historical figures introduced into it, its antiquity cannot be much less than two hundred and fifty years. There is an account of it in a pamphlet, published in 1761, entitled, *Ornaments of Churches considered;* written by an anonymous writer in defence of the churchwardens of St. Margaret's, against whom articles were exhibited in the Commissary Court, for setting up what was called " a piece of painting there, wherein were delineated several superstitious pictures and images," without the consent of the Dean of Westminster : in Biog. Brit. (from which I have compiled some parts of this note), vol. vi. p. 4051, 4052, *note;* and in Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, &c. in England.

[1] This fact is maliciously omitted by Prynne. Diary, p. 29, 30. compared with Breviat, p. 7.

for, says Laud, "he shewed not to us any method, how it might be taken, unless it were that he would have the minds of the inhabitants to be divided in the cause of religion, by sending in among them the Heidelberg Catechism [1]."

But, in the Convocation, other business was agitated. On the 5th Sunday in Lent, Dr. Goodman preached a sermon before the King, which made an uproar at Court, especially among the Puritan zealots, because it was conceived to teach covertly the doctrine of the real presence in the Communion, or at least something which had a leaning that way. It excited a dispute in the Convocation, without calling forth any decision. The King took the matter into consideration, and commanded Archbishop Abbot, the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Bishop Laud, to meet and consult about the matter. Their decision was, (and it ought to be recollected that Abbot was one of the commission,) "that some things were spoken less cautiously, but nothing falsely: that nothing was innovated by the preacher against the doctrine of the Church of England; and that the best way to remove any impression was, that the sermon should be again preached, and Bishop Goodman would then shew in what particulars he was misunderstood by his audience." This was accordingly done; and here the matter terminated.

It is a well known fact, that at this period there

[1] Diary, p. 30.

existed much error among the Puritans respecting the holy communion, and they had unhappily adopted the same opinions as many of the modern Dissenters, of reducing both it and the holy sacrament of baptism into mere rites or symbols. For, though the real corporeal presence of Christ in the communion is an error of the Papists to be rejected, inasmuch as it is contrary to the general sense of Scripture, and renders the one great atonement of Christ inefficacious, yet even in the Missal, the construction, not the language, is objectionable. It is there stated, that the bread and wine may be *to us*, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ [1], which language justly implies a worthy communicating: and hence, in opposition to the received Popish doctrine, and the irreverent notions of Dissenters, those elements are not mere signs, but holy mysteries, which, to those who worthily and reverently receive them, become by faith the body and blood of Christ, (not, however, transubstantiated,) as St. Paul himself teaches, 1 Cor. x.; and hence, moreover, in the language of the Church, we "feed on Christ by faith," and we receive as "spiritual food the body and blood of Christ." It is indeed a modern tenet, that the sacrament is a bare sign, taken in remembrance of Christ's

[1] The words of the Canon of the Mass are, "*Ut nobis* corpus et sanguis *fiant* dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi." In the language of Laud, "nothing can be more opposite to the doctrine of the *present* Church of Rome, than its *own service*."

passion[1]; but this tenet is lamentable and dangerous, and tends to undermine that reverence with which those holy mysteries ought to be received[2].

[1] Troubles and Trials of Archbishop Laud, p. 123.

[2] Even the followers of Calvin, in the sixteenth century, and Calvin himself, if rightly understood, maintain a *true* and *real presence*, though they deny transubstantiation. Hence Bellarmine's remark: "Sacramentarii sæpe dicunt *realè* corpus Christi in Cœna adesse, sed *realiter* adesse nunquam dicunt, quod legerim, nisi forte loquuntur de Cœna in cœlo."—De Eucharisto, lib. i. c. 2. § 5. And here he talks about the Sacramentarians, as he calls them, who, he says, believe in a Calvinistic figment, as it is termed by the Council of Trent. In fact, the doctrine of a spiritual *consubstantiated* presence was believed by the fathers and martyrs of the Church of England, and by Calvin, at Geneva. John Frith, one of the English Martyrs, declares, that "the inward man doth as verily receive Christ's body as the outward man receives the sacraments with his mouth;" (Fox's Mart. London edit. 1597, vol. ii. p. 943.) and I need not quote Cranmer, from the same work, pp. 1311 and 1598, or Bishop Ridley, whom Cranmer confesses to have convinced on the subject, he before being inclined to the Zuinglian notion. Fox, ut sup. p. 1703. As for Calvin, his own words are *verè et realiter*, (Calvin in 1 Cor. x. 3. *verè*, and in 1 Cor. xi. 24, *realiter*,) and those who *follow* him do actually believe the truth, that the real and true body of Christ is spiritually received in the Eucharist. Bellarmine, moreover, quotes Calvin four times, where he expressly says, (Bel. De Euchar. lib. i.) that "we receive in the Sacrament the body and blood of Christ *verè* or truly." Now, let us hear Calvin himself. "Cæterum his absurditatibus sublatis, quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris cœnæ symbolis, fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter accipio," Institut. lib. iv. c. 17. § 19.: and again, "In cœnæ mysterio, per symbola panis et vini,

Whatever were Goodman's arguments, however, on this subject, they seem to have been correct, and offence had been taken at them only by those zealots who were stimulated by the enthusiasm of the times. It is well known that the Puritans discussed the subject in their usual manner, and represented it to their adherents very differently from the real state of the case [1].

Christus verè nobis exhibetur.—Et nos participes substantiæ ejus facti sumus," § 11. Here the meaning of Calvin is obvious; and the error of the Papists and the sectaries rests in this, that the former believe in the *real* corporeal presence, (Thomas Aquinas, p. 3. q. 76. Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediæ et Supremæ Latinitatis, auctore Carolo Dufresne, tomus tertius, Paris, 1733, cols. 176—183.); and the latter, in opposition to the received doctrines of the Church, assert that the communion is nothing more than a mere memorial of Christ's dying love, or, as they call it, a commemoration.

[1] Bishop Goodman seems latterly to have gone too far, as will appear from the following anecdote. In 1640, the new Canons were set forth, which he refused to subscribe, "and it appeared afterwards," says Fuller, "that he scrupled about some passages on the corporeal presence, but whether upon Popish or Lutheran principles he best knoweth." Laud, then Archbishop, after the clergy had subscribed, advised him "to avoid obstinacy and irregularity therein, but he refused." It was in Henry VII.'s Chapel, and being greatly offended, Laud said to him, "My Lord of Gloucester, I admonish you to subscribe." Goodman remained silent, and Laud again said, "My Lord of Gloucester, I do admonish you a second time to subscribe," and immediately after, "I do admonish you a third time to subscribe." Goodman "pleaded conscience," and was in consequence suspended. He was committed to the Gatehouse, "where," says Fuller, "he got by this restraint what he could never have got by his liberty,

Nothing remarkable happened at this period, except the King's proclamation, issued on the 14th of June, concerning Montague's affair, which the Convocation had wisely declined to discuss. In this proclamation the King declared his determined resolution to guard the Church of England from all innovations. He observed, that "in all ages great disturbances, both in Church and State, have issued out of small beginnings, when the seeds of contention were not timely prevented; and finding that of late some questions and opinions had been broached in matters of doctrine and tenets of our religion, by which the professors of our religion may be drawn first into schism, and then into Popery, he hereby published to all the world his utter dislike of all those who, to shew the subtlety of their wits, or to please their own humours, or vent their own passions, shall adventure to start any new opinions not only contrary to, but differing from, the sound and orthodox grounds of the religion, established in the Church of England;" and he thereby enjoined his reverend archbishops and bishops in their several dioceses, "speedily to reclaim and repress all such spirits as shall in the least degree attempt to violate this bond of peace:" threatening exemplary punishment to those who disobeyed [1].

namely, of one reputed a Papist, to become for a short time popular, as the only consequent suffering for not subscribing to the new canons." Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 170.

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. part 1. p. 412, 413.

It is observed by Rushworth, that "the effects of this proclamation, how equally soever intended, became the stopping of the Puritan's mouths, and an uncontrolled liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party [1]." But when we recollect the conduct of the Parliament in Montague's case, we at once see the wisdom of the King's resolutions. For, as the House of Commons had referred their considerations on Montague's book to what they called their Committee for Religion, on the 18th of April, the sages of that Committee transmitted their report, through Pym their chairman, on which they passed a vote in condemnation of the book. Ludicrous as it was to see the Commons sitting as theological doctors, and reckoning no points of divinity too abstruse for *their* comprehensions, this conduct was excelled by their subsequent proceedings, more especially as they imagined that they had effectually silenced Montague, gained a signal triumph to their party, and completely condemned what they termed Arminianism. Immediately, in addition to the writers already mentioned against Montague, numbers of the seditious enthusiasts began a discussion, among whom were Prynne, Wotton, and Burton, so that, as Heylin well remarks, "the encounter seemed to be betwixt a whole army and a single person." But the King's proclamation operated as a powerful restraint. Laud and others we find busy in fulfilling the King's

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. part i. p. 413.

injunctions: seditious pamphlets were stopped at the press, and the sale of others was prohibited; while cognizance was taken of the authors and printers. Burton and Prynne, in particular, were cited before the High Commission Court, and they would have been punished, had not their friends in the Parliament procured an order to withhold the prosecution. It would appear that they behaved themselves with so great insolence, that Laud had almost resolved to make them more peaceable by some salutary discipline. The second Parliament was now dissolved [1], but the Puritans cherished against the government their accustomed hatred, which was not a little augmented by the above proceedings. The observation of Heylin is here remarkably in point, that "from this time henceforth we must look for nothing from both those Hotspurs (Burton and Prynne) but desire of revenge, a violent opposition to all persons whatsoever, who did not coincide with them, or who were not stimulated by the same outrageous zeal [2]."

[1] Vide the King's Declaration in Rushworth, ut sup. p. 406—411.

[2] Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 148.

CHAPTER IX.

1626—1629.

Removal of Laud to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells—His appointment to manage the subsidies by loan—Remarks on his instructions—Apology for the King's conduct—His hazardous situation—Death of Bishop Andrews—Laud's appointment—Bishop Williams—His conduct—Comment on it—Dr. Sibthorpe and Sir John Lamb—Sermons by Dr. Sibthorpe and Dr. Manwaring—Their fallacious positions—Passive obedience—Sentiments of the two preachers—Remarks on the doctrine of non-resistance—Definition of it—The opinions of the Classic writers and the Primitive Christians—Of modern writers—Publication of the sermons—Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—His sequestration—Received again into favour—Public affairs—Transactions of Buckingham—Promotion of Laud—The bishopric of London—Its importance—Dr. Montaigne—Death of Archbishop Matthews of York—The third Parliament—Impolitic measures of the King—Meeting of the Parliament—Conduct of the Commons—Their proceedings—Specimens of their injustice—Their practices—Arminianism—Subtle tenets of Calvin—Remarks on Arminianism—Definition of it—Observations on the Synod of Dort—Remonstrance of the Commons against Laud and Neile—Pretended Letter of a Jesuit—Remarks on it—Practices of the Jesuits—Their union with the Puritans—Prorogation of the Parliament—Laud removed to the Bishopric of London—General observations.

As it is not my intention to go minutely into detail on the general connected history of this momentous

period, except where it illustrates the conduct and actions of this great prelate, the candid reader will perhaps pardon whatever may seem to have been passed over hastily in the former chapter, since it is impossible in these limits to do justice to the events recorded. It is now necessary to follow minutely the order of those times.

Laud had been five years in the See of St. David's, during which period he had been engaged in state affairs, though not unmindful of the welfare of the Church. His fidelity had secured for him the favour of the King, and it was just that his services should be rewarded. On the 4th of May, 1626, Dr. Arthur Lake[1], Bishop of Bath and Wells, died at London, and on the 20th of June Laud was nominated by the King to the vacant see. After his nomination, we find him preaching before the King and Court at Whitehall, on the 5th of July,—a day appointed as a solemn fast, "partly on account of the pestilence yet raging in many parts of the kingdom, and partly on account of the danger of enemies threatening us[2]." This sermon was afterwards published by command of the King, and is the fourth of those preached on

[1] This prelate was at first Warden of New College, Oxford, then Master of the Hospital of St. Cross, Dean of Worcester, and, finally, Bishop of Bath and Wells. He was brother to Sir Thomas Lake, Secretary to King James. He was a man of most exemplary piety and great learning. Heylin, p. 151. Fuller, book xi. p. 126. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii.

[2] Diary, p. 34.

public occasions[1]. On the 16th of August he was translated to Bath and Wells, and on the 19th of September he had restitution of the temporalities[2].

About this period Laud was appointed by Charles to draw out certain instructions for the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the kingdom. The two Parliaments had refused to grant the King the usual subsidies, and taking an ungenerous advantage of his necessities, they had acted in a manner which warranted their immediate dissolution. As nothing could be got from the Parliament, the King's only resource was by way of loan, since, though bills for three subsidies had passed, the Parliament had been dissolved before they had become acts of statute. The sum of 173,411*l.* was deemed equal to three subsidies, which was the sum required to be raised, and as the King had already pledged the crown plate and jewels, and sold property to the city of London to the amount of 120,000*l.* he had no other resource than this expedient. Had the Parliament been actuated less by the outrageous enthusiasm of Puritanism; had they, instead of appointing committees on reli-

[1] They were all published in 4to. in the respective years they were preached, viz. 1621, 1622, 1625, 1626, and 1628.

[2] Diary, p. 35, 36. Under August 25, we find the following entry. "Friday, two robin-redbreasts flew together through the door into my study, as if one pursued the other. That sudden motion almost startled me. I was then preparing a sermon on Ephes. iv. 30, and studying."

gion, transacted the business of the nation, and left the concerns of religion to those whose duty it was, as well from their education as from their responsibility, to superintend them, Charles would never have been compelled to have had recourse to such expedients to preserve his own dignity, and his honour towards his allies. But the public encouragement of schismatics, whose hatred towards the Church even exceeded that of the Papists, fomented the sectarian fanaticism of the times, and cherished that dangerous spirit which was destined to run to fearful extremes. The King, actuated by his regard for the Protestant Reformation, and bound by his political relations, wished to aid his uncle, the King of Denmark, who was as much involved as himself with the Kings of France and Spain, their common enemies; but his Parliament had disappointed him, his subsidies were denied, and he himself, who, from his situation, was held as the grand supporter of the Reformed Faith, was rendered ridiculous in the eyes both of the Protestant and Popish states of Europe.

The King's instructions were communicated to Laud through the Duke of Buckingham, by whom he was given to understand, that he was to prepare letters to be issued to the two archbishops, and their suffragans, the contents of which were to be communicated by the latter to the inferior clergy, and by them to the people, persuading them to pay cheerfully the taxations necessary to be imposed upon them, since it was for the general peace of

Christendom, and the welfare of the Protestant religion. The instructions, as Laud informs us, were "partly political, and partly ecclesiastical, in the cause of the King of Denmark," and were to be published in every parish of the kingdom. The Bishop engaged in this confidential duty with his wonted alacrity, more especially as he saw the King's peculiar situation, and knew well the proceedings of the Puritans in the two dissolved Parliaments. A few days after he received the royal commands, he had his instructions prepared; they were first read to the Duke, and then to the King, who expressed his approbation, and they finally received the full assent of the Lords of the Privy Council. They were issued in the form of a letter from the King to the two Archbishops, and were by them communicated to their suffragans, who in turn published them in their respective dioceses.

It is, perhaps, a difficult matter to justify these instructions: not that Laud, as the author or writer of them, is to blame, because he only acted as a faithful servant to the King; but because they afford a dangerous precedent, which, were it followed, would be attended with the worst consequences. It appears from these instructions [1], that the people were to be taxed without the consent of Parliament, or without an investigation of its necessity by their representatives in the Lower House. It is, indeed, true, that the nation had never been represented in

[1] Heylin, p. 154, 155, 156.

the two former Parliaments, or, if the Puritan members spoke the language of their constituents, Charles had little chance of success with the people, who were more inflamed by those schismatics, after the dissolution. But, to tax the nation at all, without the consent of the two Houses, which form most essential parts in the constitution, was, unquestionably, though not without precedent, against the principles of the monarchy, and was, besides, calculated to render the King more unpopular. It was not to be expected that the members of the late Parliaments, especially those who had composed the Lower House, would look with indifference on this measure; and as they absurdly wished to lodge the whole executive government with themselves, and make the King a mere instrument in their hands, with these arbitrary notions of parliamentary power, they would at once take the alarm, and influence the people by their false representations. And it would have been an easy thing to effect their purposes, and oppose the King, for it might be fully expected, from their previous conduct, that they would be the last persons to criminate themselves, which they must have done, had they explained the King's situation.

But while it appears to me, from these instructions drawn up by Laud, that the people were to be taxed without the consent of Parliament, and, therefore, so far as I understand the subject, if it was not without precedents in former reigns, it was at least unconstitutional, and against the essential

principles of a free monarchy such as that of Britain, where the King, Lords, and Commons, equally legislate, I do not say that Charles cannot be justified. It must be recollected, that no monarch was ever placed in more hazardous or trying circumstances. Annoyed by turbulent schismatics on the one hand, and by Papists on the other; disappointed by the proceedings of his Parliaments, who neglected the chief business of the state for matters with which they had little concern, and which only gratified their enthusiasm; and finding that they represented him in the worst possible manner to the people, this was, perhaps, the only expedient which Charles could adopt, inasmuch as he had found the summoning of Parliaments of no utility. And, though it must be admitted, that the pulpit ought not to be the place for enforcing political measures, yet, from the fact, that the Church of England is an essential part of the British Constitution, and also, because the clergy, in the exercise of their daily ministrations, are more immediately brought into contact with the people, they were the only persons by whom the King's conduct could be fairly and justly represented. And, moreover, as, notwithstanding the objections of schismatics and visionary zealots, the alliance between Church and State, in other words, a church *by law* established, is not only necessary, but highly imperative, both from Scripture and antiquity, for the welfare and advancement of true religion; it is just that the State should call in the aid of the Church in mat-

ters partly ecclesiastical and partly political, because, generally speaking, the Church is part of the State, the one is connected with, and dependent on, the other. And it is to be farther observed, that these instructions were not designed as a law, but merely as a resource upon a trying emergency: the taxation, if it may be called so, for it rather appears to have been a kind of voluntary subsidy, was to be *recommended,* not enforced; the clergy were commanded to "instruct and exhort the people," by explaining to them the peculiar aspect of affairs abroad; they were "rightly to inform the people committed to their care, that this war, which now was so pregnant with danger, was not undertaken rashly, or without advice:" and, as if to explain the dark practices of the two Parliaments, they were reminded that all treaties between Spain and France had been dissolved by their advice, and that they alone stimulated the war with Spain. "To effect this," said the King, speaking in the language of Laud, "they desired our aid and assistance, and urged us to work our dear father to entertain this course. This, upon their persuasions and promises of supply, we readily undertook and effected, and cannot now be left in the business without the sin and shame of all men:—sin, because aid and supply for the defence of the kingdom, and the like affairs of state, especially such as are advised and assumed by parliamentary counsel, are due to the King from his people, by all law both of God and man:—and shame, if they forsake the King, while

he pursues their own counsel, just and honourable, and which could not, under God, but have been as successful, if it had been followed and supplied in time, as we desired and laboured to effect." The King declares that he trusts to the loyal hearts of his people to aid him in his emergencies,—he recommends to the clergy a diligent discharge of their sacred duties, and to "direct and encourage his loving people, in this and all other necessary services, both of God, the Church, and the throne." Now, when we bear in memory, that the measure in question was not to be enforced by law, as indeed it could not, wanting the sanction of Parliament, it will appear evident that, though the measure was in itself impolitic, and eventually fruitless, yet, when we take into account the King's situation, and the previous conduct of the Puritans, he cannot be said to have encroached on the liberties of the people, by any undue exercise of the royal prerogative [1].

[1] It is necessary here to mention, in vindication of the above remarks, that a distinction must be kept in view between the instructions to the Clergy, to which of course I peculiarly refer in the text, and the King's Declaration to the people concerning the loan, and its conditions. The King's uncle, the King of Denmark, had been brought into trouble chiefly for his espousing the cause of the Elector Palatine, the King's brother-in-law. In the King's private instructions to the Commissioners, they were commanded to enforce it from every individual, if they would not otherwise assent. Rushworth, vol. i. part. i. p. 418—422. Whitelock's Memorials, Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. Hume, Rapin, &c.

But, whatever opinions may be entertained on this subject, one thing is clear, that Laud acted as a faithful servant to a prince, who was every where surrounded by difficulties, from which his Parliaments would not relieve him. The advancement of religion, and the welfare of the Church, were Charles' great objects, and Laud was well qualified to judge on these important matters. By his wise and prudent management of this affair, he was still farther advanced in the good opinion of the King; nor were his services allowed to pass unrewarded. At this very time died Dr. Launcelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester, and Dean of the Chapel Royal; a prelate whose name is recorded among the illustrious worthies of the Church of England. Grave without affectation, profoundly learned without pedantry, religious without any of the Puritan fanaticism, this distinguished prelate and great man ought never to be mentioned without reverence and admiration [1]. His dignified and serious deportment is said to have restrained Charles from any inclination to merriment in his presence. His publications are not very numerous, but such as remain are sufficient indications of his profound acquirements [2]. After his decease, the See of Winchester

[1] Fuller, book xi. p. 126. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. Collier, Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 739.

[2] The Works which Bishop Andrews published during his lifetime were two volumes in Latin, written in defence of King James against the attacks of the learned Cardinal Bellarmine, already mentioned. In 1609, when Bishop Andrews was in

was vacant for nearly two years, the King appropriating its revenues to supply his necessities[1]; but Laud was appointed, on the 3d of October, Dean of the Chapel Royal; and on the 6th he was admitted,

the See of Chichester, appeared a quarto volume, entitled, "Tortura Torti, sive, ad Matthæi Torti Librum Responsio, qui nuper editus contra Apologiam serenissimi potentissimique principis Jacobi, Dei Gratia Magnæ Britanniæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regis, pro juramento fidelitatis." In 1610, Bellarmine published, "Pro Responsione sua ad Librum Jacobi, Magnæ Britanniæ Regis, cui titulus est, triplici modo triplex cuneus, Apologia." Bishop Andrews, now in the See of Ely, replied to Bellarmine the same year, in a quarto volume published at London, entitled, "Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, quam nuper edidit contra Præfationem Monitoriam serenissimi ac potentissimi principis Jacobi, &c. omnibus Christianis Monarchis, Principibus, atque Ordinibus inscriptam." He also wrote a small tract, entitled, "Determinatio Theologica, de jure-jurando exigendo," 4to. London, 1593. (Heylin, p. 157. Brittan. Scriptores,) and a small volume of sermons. But after his death, Laud, and Buckeridge, Bishop of Ely, the latter having been removed to that See from Rochester the year before, collected and published ninety-six of his sermons in 1628, and dedicated them to the King. Some other productions were also published in 1628. Bishop Buckeridge preached his funeral sermon, which is printed at the end of the large volume of sermons, in which his character is admirably drawn. A small book appeared as his during his life-time, entitled *Catechetical Doctrines*, which he would never acknowledge, it being published, he said, without his consent, and containing imperfect extracts from his lectures, when he read the Catechism Lecture at Pembroke Hall, Oxford.

[1] This expedient of Charles cannot be justified, nevertheless it is not without precedent, as will be found in the History of Winchester, in Hume's History, vol. ii. Carte's History, Rapin, Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. i. Le Neve's Fasti.

by the Earl of Montgomery, Lord Chamberlain, after taking the usual oaths. This promotion was an act of especial favour on the part of the King, although Charles had another eminence in reserve for him; for on the 2d of October, two days after his nomination to this office, we find him recording in his Diary, that the Duke of Buckingham had signified to him the King's resolution, that, in the event of Archbishop Abbot's decease, who was at this time very infirm, he should be removed to the See of Canterbury [1].

We are now to observe the effects of these instructions on the people, as connected with the clergy. Many of the inferior clergy were zealous in opposing the enemies of the Church; among whom was Dr. Robert Sibthorpe, vicar of Brackley, Northamptonshire. But among those who resisted

[1] Diary, p. 36. Breviat, by Prynne, p. 9. It appears from the Diary, p. 36, 37, and Heylin, p. 158, that from the beginning of James' reign, the sovereign never attended prayers in the chapel-royal, but whenever he appeared, the anthem was begun, and the preacher entered the pulpit. Laud, however, who rightly thought, that the sermon, being a mere human composition and no part of public worship, was of the very least consequence, as it really is, recommended to his Majesty to attend prayers, or, at least, whenever he entered the chapel, that the officiating priest might proceed to the end of the service without interruption. "The most religious King," says he, in his pious notation, "not only assented to this request, but also gave me thanks. This had not been hitherto done, from the beginning of James' reign to this day. Now, thanks be to God, it obtaineth." Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 740.

the loan was Dr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, who, since his disgrace at Court, had been indefatigable in thwarting his former friends, and seemed to avenge himself by openly patronising the Puritans. Sibthorpe and Sir John Lamb anticipating the danger which would arise from the laxity of that prelate, represented to him the seditious state of the country in his diocese, that it was overrun by factious persons, who would not conform to the Church, but who held unlawful fasts and meetings upon the pretence of religious worship; that, in particular, they held one fast from nine in the morning till eight at night; that they collected money without authority, and, therefore, they desired permission to take cognizance of them. Williams, however, who had not forgotten Laud's opposition to him, and the decline of the King's favour, was determined to take his own way, and to gratify his revenge against the Court, by encouraging the faction. "I will not proceed," said he, "against the Puritans, for *I expect not another bishopric.* You may complain of them, if you please, at the Council; but I am under a cloud already, and have the Duke of Buckingham for my enemy. I wish not to excite the Puritans against myself, as I am certain they will eventually prevail. Besides, the King, in the first year of his reign, gave a declaration in favour of the Puritans, in reply to a petition from the Lower House."

When Bishop Williams uttered this deplorable language, in which there was so much of the ambitious ecclesiastic, and so little of the Christian

Bishop, and, above all, so little regard for the Church of which he was a dignitary, he forgot, or pretended to forget, in the advantage which he took of the King's Declaration at Oxford, that it chiefly bore against the Popish recusants, while, at the same time, the Puritans, being at the opposite extreme, were not permitted to pass without animadversion. But his conduct was unbecoming his rank and situation, and we evidently discover the language of the discontented and disappointed courtier, who, if he had been otherwise situated, would have willingly aided the Church to repress the faction, had he conceived that his own interest would have been advanced. He expected, he said, *no other bishopric;* he saw that the *Puritans would prevail;* and, therefore, if he did not proceed against them, he might perhaps be permitted to enjoy his temporalities. Such was doubtless his inference; but he would have been much more consistent had he done his duty, and nobly resolved to fall with the Church, if it was destined to fall. Dr. Sibthorpe and Sir John Lamb, however, still pressed him to take cognizance of the schismatics; upon which he asked them, what manner of people they were, and of what condition. "They seem to the world," replied Sir John Lamb, "to be such as would not swear, whore, nor drink; yet can they lie, cozen, and deceive[1]. They frequently hear two sermons

[1] I do not insert this language as if it were literally true, and, although there were many instances of licentiousness, it must

a day, repeat the same again, fast all day long, and pray." The Bishop then demanded, if they complied with the loan; and being answered in the affirmative, he denied that they were Puritans, and, therefore, would not proceed against them [1]. Sibthorpe then told him, that he was sorry the Church was so ill governed; and transmitting these facts to the Court, an information was laid against the Bishop in the Star-Chamber, for which he was afterwards brought into trouble [2].

be received with caution. Generally speaking, little can be said against the Puritans on that subject, yet there were many instances of hypocrisy, not in the people only, but in the leaders, and their extraordinary pretensions to religion tended very much to make them feel nothing of its influence. Religion, as I have elsewhere stated, for I profess myself to be no zealot for evangelism in the present use of the word *evangelical*, does not consist in any peculiar phraseology, in superior pretensions to sanctity, or in noisy parade and ostentation, such as to be seen in too many meetings of the day, *in* (alas!) and *out* of the Church, but it consists in the quiet and unobstrusive devotions of the heart, it is modest and retiring, doing good as there is opportunity. Whatever might be the *practice* of the Puritans, it is not my business to inquire; our present concern is with their *principles*.

[1] This reasoning of the Bishop was absurd. He concluded that because a man complied with the loan *he was no Puritan*. On the same principle, if the Papists complied, and many of them did so, *they were not Papists*. Some of the Puritans, or Calvinists, were well affected towards the King, and Sibthorpe wanted the Bishop to proceed against them, not in a *civil*, but in an *ecclesiastical* manner, as enemies to the Church, which they undoubtedly were.

[2] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 420, 421. About this time Laud has

The clergy who were well affected towards the Church acted according to the instructions of the Court, and explained to the people the King's peculiar situation, for which they have been ignorantly charged with preaching the famous doctrine of passive obedience. But the two preachers whose sermons excited the greatest interest, were Dr. Robert Sibthorpe, the vicar of Brackley, as aforesaid, and Dr. Roger Manwaring, one of the King's Chaplains, and Rector of St. Giles' in the Fields. At the Lent Assizes, held at Northampton, Feb. 22, 1626, Dr. Sibthorpe preached a discourse from Rom. xiii. 7. "Render therefore to all their dues;" and the purport of that sermon was, "to justify the lawfulness of the general loan, and of the King's imposing taxes by his own royal power, without consent of Parlia-

entered in his Diary a dream. "Sunday, January 14, towards morning, I dreamed that the Bishop of Lincoln came, I knew not whither, with iron chains, but returning loosed from them, leaped on horseback, went away, neither could I overtake him." Rushworth interprets this dream as signifying the release of the Bishop from his confinement, his advancement to the See of York, and Laud's own confinement and subsequent trials. It is an easy thing to interpret a dream after the person's death, and to fasten it on any action of the person which may be convenient. Certainly, Laud's dispute with Williams made a considerable impression upon his mind, as appears from various parts of his Diary. Mr. Hallam chooses to look upon these notations of dreams, &c. as weaknesses, (Constitutional History of England, 4to. vol. ii.) but, with all due respect for Mr. H.'s authority, I am inclined to look upon them in a very different light.

ment; and to prove that the people, in point of conscience and of religion, ought cheerfully to submit to such loans and taxes without any opposition[1]." These singular, and it must not be denied, unconstitutional propositions, which in their principles are dangerous to the liberty of the subject, he endeavoured to illustrate by a variety of scriptural arguments. Referring to the aspect of the times, he thus addressed his auditors: "Seriously consider how, as Jeroboam took the opportunity of the breach between Rehoboam and his subjects to bring idolatry into Israel, so the Papists lie in wait if they could find a breach between our sovereign and his subjects, which the Lord forbid, to introduce their superstition into England. I speak no more than what I have heard from themselves, whilst I have observed their frowardness to offer double according to an act of Parliament, so providing, yea, to profess, that they would depart with the half of their goods. And how or why can this frowardness be on them, but in the hope to cast the imputation of frowardness upon us, and so to them (that which the Jesuit will not suffer them to be) loving and loyal subjects?"

These remarks are ambiguous enough, yet, so far as they bear on the general argument, they are indisputable. The Papists were on the watch, and not without hope, that if any dispute should arise, they would be able to re-establish their power. The

[1] Heylin, p. 158.

insolence of the French domestics who composed the Queen's household was well known; and though they enjoyed not the royal favour, nay, though Charles, while he was disputing with his own subjects, was secretly encouraging the French Hugonots, the Puritans of France, they still conducted themselves as if secure of protection. But we must observe another part of Dr. Sibthorpe's sermon. In one place he asserts, that because the Prince, who is the head, chooses his court and council, it is therefore his duty to enact and to direct laws. This he endeavoured to prove from the Jewish Scriptures, Eccles. viii. 3, 4. In another place he observes, "If Princes command any thing which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God, or nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment, without either resisting, railing, or reviling, and so yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one. I know of no other case but one of those three, wherein a subject can excuse himself with passive obedience: but in all other he is bound to active obedience[1]."

Dr. Manwaring, however, went farther than Dr. Sibthorpe. In two sermons which he preached, one before the King at Oatlands, and another to his own parishioners, he insisted, "that the King is not bound to observe the laws of the realm concern-

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 422, 423. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 740.

ing the subject's rights and liberties, but that his royal will and command in imposing loans and taxes, though without the consent of Parliament, ought to be obeyed, at the hazard of eternal salvation; that those who refused to comply with this loan, transgressed against the law of God, the King's supreme authority, and were guilty of impiety, disloyalty, and rebellion; that the authority of Parliament is not necessary for the raising of such supplies, and that the slow proceedings of such great assemblies were not adapted to the exigencies of a state, but would rather produce impediments to the great designs of Princes [1]."

While I verily believe those preachers did not intend what they said to the full extent, while it may be doubted whether they were aware of the tendency of the opinions they set forth, as subversive of part of the constitution of this kingdom, and while I am convinced that they so preached from the best of motives, namely, out of respect to, and regard for, their sovereign, and as mainly endeavouring to counteract the seditious principles which had been disseminated throughout the nation; it must be admitted, without all doubt, that this was "extravagant divinity," as Collier justly terms it, "subversive of the constitution, and preaching directly against the statute-book;" and "were it pursued through all its consequences, would make

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 424. Collier, ut sup. p. 743. Neal, vol. ii. p. 174, 175.

Magna Charta, and the other laws for securing property, signify little." These were themes, as Lord Clarendon well remarks, very unfit for the place, and scandalous for the persons who set them forth, seeing that they "presumed to determine matters unconnected with their profession, and, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, gave unto Cæsar that which did not belong to him." It is extremely dangerous to define with exactness the royal power, inasmuch as a King without power, and entirely under the control of popular laws and popular assemblies, is *no King*, and without any prerogative at all, in which situation were he placed, as undoubtedly Charles I. was, there would be no barrier to the insolence of subjects. I mean not to comprehend under this remark the nobles of the land, who with the private men of rank and fortune, are the strength of a populous nation, inasmuch as the inferior orders are dependent on them for support. And it is difficult, if not impossible, to say when subjects may rise in rebellion against their Sovereign, and yet preserve their virtue and integrity; for such is the constitution of the human mind, and more especially among those who, the general population of a nation, seldom or never reason from cause to effect, that were such opinions to be disseminated, or, in their dissemination, were they not to be restrained by the salutary arm of power, a tyranny would be established as intolerant as ever was exercised by the most despotic sovereign. But while those men ought most especially to beware

who allure the *wrong-thinking*, and deceive the *unthinking*, by the pleasing theme of liberty, thereby filling them with turgid and fallacious hopes, and exalting every mechanic and village politician into a judge over his superiors, it must unquestionably be admitted, that if, when men are required by their rulers to do things which are against "the laws of God or nature," they must "undergo punishment for not doing them, without either resisting, railing, or reviling, and so yield a passive obedience where they cannot yield an active one," and that, too, under the "penalty of eternal damnation;" and if the King is not bound, according to Dr. Manwaring, "to preserve the subjects in their legal rights and liberties," where is the security of the subject, where the sacredness, if I may so speak of his property—of property which he may have truly acquired by the "sweat of his brow," where, in short, is there protection for any of those endearing relations which exist between man and man; where is there protection for life itself? It was so, certainly, in a degree, though not to the extent of the notions of those two clergymen, in the earlier period of the English monarchy, before the pusillanimous John of Anjou ascended the throne; and Doomsday Book is a sufficient attestation of the iron sway of the sceptre by William the Conqueror. But the irrevocable charter of English liberty, which John was compelled to sign by the illustrious nobles of England, who disdained to resign the land of their fathers to abjectness, and who spurned at the idea of selling their

birthright, established English liberty on a sure and certain vantage-ground, from which it cannot be dislodged unless a second Puritan rebellion, the result of crafty sedition, discontentment, and religious fanaticism, overthrow the monarchy, and bury the charter of liberty beneath its mighty ruins, which will support the tyranny of a second usurpation. And I would here assert my conviction, in thus commenting on the dangerous and imprudent opinions of those clergymen, that it is not among the populace of the nation, or the people, if it will make me better understood, that we are to look for the defenders and the champions of liberty; but if that period should arrive, when the reigning monarch shall attempt to crush the charter of our rights, it is first to England's peers and barons that we must look, who will not hesitate to imitate their illustrious ancestors; and, secondly, to the *Bishops of the Church*, who will not fail to follow the example of those their venerable predecessors, whose conduct was more beneficial than all the pretended preservation of rights and liberties by the Puritan faction; those noble prelates, for whom were offered the united prayers of England, who received the deserved congratulations of their countrymen, and taught the ill-advised son of Charles I. that Popery in England had fallen, never, we trust, to rise again.

Dr. Sibthorpe's attempt to illustrate the chief magistrate's unlimited power from the Old Testament, must not be admitted; because the Jewish government was widely different from the English;

in the language of the Church historian, " to argue from Palestine to England, and make the Jewish constitution a standard for all other governments, is slender reasoning, and shews that the preacher was very defective either in his honesty or his understanding." By this illustration he, in fact, fell into the great error of the Scottish Presbyterians and the English Puritans, who made the examples of Old Testament history their models; who were accustomed to preach from those portions of it, which, they well knew, would inflame the zeal of the people by their scriptural allusions, and who were sufficiently active in finding authority for all that they said and did, in the historical characters of the Jewish Scriptures [1]. Whereas, the Old Testament political economy has no bearing on us at all; many of the actions of the persons recorded therein we dare not imitate or adduce as authorities; its constitution cannot with equal facility be appreciated by us, who live in another age, and under another dispensation; and, in short, many of the facts of the Old Testament, like some of those of the New, especially in so far as the practice of the holy apostles is concerned, in their intercourse with heathen nations while planting the Christian Church, are not applicable to us at all, and are delivered not for our example, but for our instruction and edification.

[1] Goodall's Queen Mary, 12mo. vol. i. p. 247—250, where the reader will find a remarkable illustration in the conduct of the Scottish Reformers.

It was, in short, this very spirit of *private interpretation* of the Scriptures, which ought at all times to be avoided, that set no limits to the religious notions of the Puritans, and prompted the fanatics of the Commonwealth, as it is called, to change that petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy *kingdom* come," to a phraseology more agreeable to their enthusiasm, and, therefore, they rendered it, "Thy *commonwealth* come[1]."

[1] The above is a true anecdote of English Puritanism, and luckily there is one of Scotch Presbyterianism on the same subject. Many English Bibles were printed in 1640, at Amsterdam and Edinburgh, (Holland and Scotland were the same, then, in religion) imported into England, printed on wretched paper, and sold at low prices, "little margin," says Fuller, most happily, "yet greater than the care of the corrector, many most abominable errata being passed therein." He gives one instance, in the Scotch *new version*, Jer. iv. 17. Speaking of the whole commonwealth of Judah, instead of "because she hath been *rebellious* against me, saith the Lord," in the Bible printed at Edinburgh, 1637, the Scots thought proper to render it, "because she hath been *religious* against me, saith the Lord." This was during the monarchy, but they could not endure the idea of a *rebellious commonwealth*, that glorious consummation they had in prospect. "Many complaints," says Fuller, "were made, especially by the Company of Stationers, against these false printed Bibles, arguing great advantage to the Papists, but nothing was therein effected. For at this juncture of time came in the Scotch army, and invaded the northern parts of England. What secret solicitations invited them hither, it is not my province to inquire. Many beheld them as the only physicians of the distempered state, and believed that they gave not their patient a visit on pure charity, but having either received or being well promised their fee hither." Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 171, 172.

To discuss Dr. Manwaring's assertions, after saying so much, would be needless, as the perusal of them is their own refutation. But let us see what can be said in justification of the *motives* of those clergymen; that being the only certain standard. I have already dwelt on the necessities of the King, on the conduct of the two Parliaments, and the King's peculiar situation with foreign powers. Now, though the Puritan historian calls Dr. Sibthorpe "a man of mean parts, but of sordid ambition," and though Manwaring was in his opinion little better, might not their assertions arise from the nature of their education, and from the fact of their not being politicians? For, in every case, the domination of the multitude ought to be restrained; but, if we are to have a tyrant, (I use the word in its *original sense*, not in its present acceptation) rather let us have one than hundreds: let us have one whose princely birth and education will command respect, and to whom there is even a satisfaction in yielding, than a number of daring and upstart demagogues, who, using the word liberty, and yet, unable to define it, choose to scoff at noble birth, because they themselves are too basely born. Severe, indeed, is the rule of such political philosophers. But, if even the appearance of grandeur, not to say royalty, in distress and misfortune will at times move the heart of the sturdiest republican, much more will it operate on those who love their Sovereign, even though they may be inclined to assign him a greater power than the constitution warrants. The loyal mem-

bers of the Church of England, in that age of enthusiasm, dreaded the predominance of the rabble, as will, indeed, every well-wisher to his country at any period; it was, therefore, their wish to restrain this dangerous fermentation of sedition, and if those two clergymen went to extremes on the one hand, the Puritans were not one whit behind them on the other. They were, moreover, scholars, and they needed not to be informed of the nature of the popular governments of Greece and Rome, or of those tumultary mobs who often besieged the senate-house of Rome, silenced the most eloquent orators, dismayed the bravest warriors, and made the momentary expression of their excited passions the rule and decision of the law[1]. But this was not all; much higher authority could they quote for the doctrine of non-resistance, even in Christian times, and by Christian men. For, setting aside the doctrine of forbearance, which the divine Saviour inculcated, and those maxims of civil obedience even to Pagan princes, and in reality tyrants, which his holy apostle St. Paul enforced, the primitive Christians practised passive obedience to the very letter, and were of opinion, as the Canon of our Church expresses it, that subjects *ought not to take arms against their Kings, offensive or defensive, under any pretence whatsoever,* not even for *religion,* which, of all things, is the most important and mo-

[1] Livy, lib. xxiii. Cicero, Oratio pro Milone. i. Tacit. Vita Agric. Sallust. Cat. Bell. xlviii.

mentous to man. It would be needless to mention here the persecutions and martyrdoms they endured; that they became the ridicule of the Greeks, renowned for their worldly wisdom; that they became the prey of wild beasts, and the impious sport of men whose natures were not far removed from that of beasts, in the Roman amphitheatres; that they endured deaths which make humanity shudder, with the most magnanimous fortitude and devotion. I need not refer to the often-repeated testimony, that they were the best soldiers in the Roman armies, serving under Pagan commanders, and that an instance of rebellion by them is utterly unknown. The Christian Fathers are clear upon the subject of non-resistance, and religiously inculcated it, though, if any circumstances could warrant the contrary, their own were not the most favourable. So are the ancient philosophers. Tacitus declares, that good Emperors are to be wished for; but that, whatever they be, they are to receive submission[1]. Seneca was of the same opinion[2]; and Cicero, who was himself no mean patriot, expressly asserts, that no force is to be offered against a man's parents, or his country, and therefore, as has been well remarked, not against his Prince, who is *pater patriæ*, the father of his country[3]. Aristotle, as quoted by the

[1] Tacit. Hist. Lib. iv.

[2] Seneca, Epist. lxxxiii. "Boni expetendi, qualescunque tolerandi."

[3] "Nec patri, nec patriæ vim offerri oportere." Epist. Fam. 9. lib. i.

learned Grotius[1], laid it down as an axiom, that though the magistrate offered violence, no violence was to be used in return, in other words, that it was unlawful to resist; and Plutarch denounces those who dare to offer violence to the person of a King[2]. Sallust says, that what the people cannot do with impunity, the King can do, as belonging to his office. To the same purpose, also, many more of the Roman and Greek writers[3], among

[1] "Apud Sallustium est," says the learned Grotius, "*Impune quid vis facere, id est regem esse.* Hinc, ubique majestas id est dignitas, sive populi, sive unius qui summo fungitur imperio, tot legibus, tot pœnis defenditur quæ constare non potest si maneat resistendi licentia. Miles qui castigare volenti se centurioni resisteret, si vitam tenuit, militiam mutat; si ex industria fregit, vel manum centurioni intulit, capite punitur. *Et apud Aristotelem* est, Εἰ ἀρχὴν ἔχων ἐπάταξεν οὐ δεῖ ἀντιπληγῆναι, *Si magistratum gerens aliquem verberavit, ipse reverberandus non est.*" Grotius, De Jure Belli ac Pacis, lib. i. cap. iv. n. 2. Amsterdam edit. 1651.

[2] "Nec fas nec licitum Regis corpori manus inferre." Plut. in Vita Agidis et Cleomenis.

[3] Many other passages might be quoted, both from the same writers and from others, namely, Livy, Virgil, Terence, &c.; and among the Greeks, Thucydides, Xenophon (Memorabilia), Plato, &c. Tacitus has a yet stronger remark—"Principi summum rerum arbitrium Dii dederunt, subditis obsequii gloria relicta est;" and also, "Indigna digna habenda sunt rex quæ facit." And Seneca, moreover, "Æquum atque iniquum regis imperium feras," which two lines, says Grotius, (ut sup.) are taken from the verse of Sophocles:

Ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στήσειε, τοῦ δὲ χρὴ κλύειν,
Καὶ σμικρὰ καὶ δίκαια καὶ ταναντία.

He who wishes to obtain a correct and complete knowledge of this subject, will do well to consult and to study Grotius De Jure Belli et Pacis.

whom, let it be observed, and especially the latter, existed that popular form of government, which the modern advocates of liberalism, who dogmatically set forth the fallacious adage, that the voice of the people is the voice of God, so much admire, but which they most assuredly do not understand; otherwise the republicanism of Greece and Rome would never have been cited as affording examples of liberty and public opinion, because they afford no specimens of these at all, and because the people were actually more fettered by the predominance of the rabble, than they would have been under the most complete despotism[1].

[1] I may refer to a justly popular and learned work, recently published, respecting the state of public opinion among the ancients. In the treatise "On the Rise, Progress, and Present State of Public Opinion," by W. A. Mackinnon, Esq. the principle that the Greek and Roman republics afford specimens of free and unrestrained public opinion, is refuted by some very convincing propositions. "The resolves of the ancients in these republics," observes Mr. M., "seem often to have been determined by popular clamour, which was more likely to be found among them than public opinion," (p. 19, 20.) I go farther, however, than Mr. M.; for the reader must not suppose that I presume to identify my own opinions with his in these pages, as that, perhaps, might be deemed by the admirers of his excellent treatise no compliment: and I am disposed to question, whether there was any thing ever "resembling public opinion," at any time in existence in those republics, always excepting the philosophers, who, as I have stated in the text, were too often awed into submission. For a few proofs of this, see Xenoph. Mem. 1. Laertius, ii. § 98—102. Anton. et Maxim. Serm. 37. Athen. lib. x. p. 422. Mr. M. has himself stated the cause—they wanted "proper religious feeling:" in other words, their theology was wretched.

And here I would remark, for it appears to me that this important subject ought not to be passed over lightly, that though the defenders of the royal power, as independent in itself, are often abused by their opponents for holding an alleged maxim, that "the King can do no wrong," which maxim the liberalists do most grievously pervert and misunderstand; yet they ought to be silent altogether on the subject, because, even granting for a moment that the maxim is absurd, they themselves hold one much more ridiculous, namely, the one above quoted, that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." This dogma, so unphilosophical and untrue, not to say, subversive of civil government, and unworthy of him who pretends to the dignity of a statesman, is continually brought forth to public view by the advocates of what is termed moderation, or, as they term themselves, the defenders of the people; and no one who knows any thing of the history of the present day can be ignorant of the absurdities to which it has given rise. If we are to believe them, the people, the *profanum vulgus*, are every thing; the King and the nobles of the nation are dependent on them for support, and therefore, in their own rank, nothing. Instruct the people, they continually exclaim, that is, in their language, do not make them religious or good men; do not initiate them in the principles of Christianity, (the most momentous of all human concerns), these are too paltry, and puerile, and unserviceable; but make them philosophers, write treatises of *useful knowledge* for them, explain to them the principles of science, and then

they will be happy: we shall have a nation of philosophers and legislators. Now, who does not see the folly and absurdity, not to say, impiety, of this bombast? Who does not see that it will be attended with the very worst consequences; that it will engender a spirit of discontent among the lower classes at their condition, and that the merest fool will think himself perfectly qualified to sit in judgment on his superiors? I admire not the *bliss* of ignorance, but *ne sutor ultra crepidam* ought not to be forgotten. Have not the wisest of men,—men of the greatest genius and profound research, spent long and laborious lives in the pursuit of one single branch of science, and yet left it comparatively imperfect, and at last have been compelled to exclaim, with the great master of antiquity, that at best they knew nothing?

It is clear, then, that the clergy of the seventeenth century who defended the government have the general authority of antiquity in their favour, and we shall soon see, that they were not without the authority of Scripture and the primitive Church. By the law of nature, indeed, as Grotius has observed, men, as individuals, have a right to resist injuries inflicted by their neighbours; but that differs widely from resisting the commands of government [1]. And, therefore, I here observe, that had

[1] "Et naturaliter quidem," says Grotius, "omnes ad arcendam a se injuriam jus habent resistendi, ut supra diximus. Sed *civili societate* ad tuendam tranquillitatem instituta, statim civitati jus quoddam majus in nos et nostra nascitur, quatenus

there been no *Magna Charta* in this country, the doctrine of passive obedience, when preached, was not an outrage on the subject's natural rights. That very doctrine, which excites the wrath of those who affect to sneer at legitimacy, is laid down in the Jewish Scriptures, if it be allowable to refer to them; but, more particularly, it is laid down by the wisest men of antiquity, even by those who were themselves no mean patriots[1]. To come, then, to the primitive Church, the members of which endured hardships of every kind, and were, in very truth, the sport of their pagan rulers, we have the doc-

ad finem illum id necessarium est. Potest igitur civitas jus illud resistendi promiscuum publicæ pacis et ordinis causa prohibere. Et quin voluerit, dubitandum non est, cum aliter non posset finem suum consequi. Nam si maneat promiscuum illud resistendi jus, non jam civitas erit, sed dissociata multitudo." Grotius, De Jure, ut sup.

[1] Let us only observe the conduct of the Romans, for example, in their government. It is said that Romulus was a despot, but arbitrary measures were necessary in the infant state of Rome, when the inhabitants were a band of adventurers, who had no ties of country or of kindred to unite them together. The age, moreover, was early in the history of improvement. But no sooner had the Romans overthrown the royal power, than they were doomed to the tyranny of republicanism, and hence they continually changed their government, till Augustus assumed the imperial purple. Before that illustrious statesman, treading in the steps of his no less illustrious relative, Julius Cæsar, firmly united the empire in his own person as its head, and deprived the Senate of all opportunities for faction, what a melancholy history have we of Roman turbulence and avidity for new governments!

trine of non-resistance clearly set forth by Tertullian[1]: and, in another place, speaking of certain insurrections incited by Cassius, Niger, and Albinus, he denies that any Christians were concerned in them, because resistance was against the spirit of the Christian religion[2]. Constantine the Great, although he established Christianity, was at last an Arian, and was by no means favourable to the orthodox Catholics, as is proved by his treatment of St. Athanasius. An insurrection was stimulated by one Magnentius, not on religious but on political grounds, with which St. Athanasius was charged. But the Father refuted the calumny, and shewed that it was against the practice of the Christian Church[3]. The armies of Julian the Apostate were almost entirely composed of Christians, but they rebelled not, nor refused him obedience, except when he commanded them to worship idols: yet they obeyed Julian not from want of power, for at his death those soldiers exclaimed, that they were all Christians: and when we recollect that the army in those days was the great strength of the monarch, we shall at once see, that, had Julian's soldiers been inclined, they could easily and successfully have

[1] Apol. c. 87. [2] Tert. ad Scap. c. ii. § 2.

[3] Κρατείτω ἡ ἀλήθεια παρὰ σοὶ, καὶ μὴ ἀφῆς ὑπόνοιαν κατὰ πάσης ἐκκλησίας γενεσθεος, ὡς τοιαῦτα βουλευομένων καὶ γραφόντων τῶν Χριστιανῶν, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἐπισκόπων. St. Athan. Apolog. ad Constant. Opera studiosius quàm antea fuerunt, a situ vindicata, &c. Gr. et Lat. Accessit præterea Operi Erasmi Roterodami Paraclesis. fol. Argent. 1522.

rebelled[1]. In like manner, St. Ambrose declared to Valentinian, on one occasion, that the Christians present nothing against his forces but their prayers and tears; "These," said that holy father, "are my weapons:" and yet we know well, that, had he been inclined, he was in a favourable situation to excite an insurrection. "We pray," said he, "O Augustus, we do not fight."[2] With respect to defensive arms, the opinions of the primitive Fathers are equally clear[3]. Bodinus, of the sixteenth century, affirms, that resistance must not be offered to, nor arms taken against, a Prince, even if he were impious and wicked[4]; and the illustrious Grotius

[1] St. Aug. in Psal. 124, Opera Omnia, fol. 10 tom. Basle. 1540-3. Desid. Erasmi. Historia Ecclesiastica, a Socrate, lib. iii. cap. xxii.

[2] St. Ambros. in Orat. Colloc. inter Epistolas xxxii. et xxxiii. Basle edit. 1538.

[3] St. Cyprian. Epist. ad Demet. "Inde est enim, quod nemo nostrum, quando apprehenditur, reluctatur, nec adversus injustam violentiam vestram, quamvis nimius et copiosus noster fit populus, ulciscitur." Lactantius, De Divinis Institutionibus, lib. v. c. xxii. St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, lib. xxii. c. 6. edit. per Joan. Ludov. Viven. fol. Bas. 1522, atque, fait François par Gent. Hervet, et enrichy de plusieurs Annotations, par Franç. de Belle-Forest. fol. Par. 1570.

[4] Vide Jean Bodin. Les Six Livres de la Republique, fol. Lyon. 1580, et Lat. "Nec singulis civibus, nec universis fas est summi principis vitam famam aut fortunas in discrimen vocare, et si omnium scelerum, &c. De Repub. ab autore redditi, fol. Lug. 1586, c. v. p. 210, 211, 212. Selecta de Vita et Scriptis Jo. Bodini, a Jo. Hen. Schlegel, 4to. 1715. et Dissertatio de Jure suffragandi Principum Imperii, &c. ab eodem.

goes still farther, for he declares that those who hold contrary opinions are factious men, seeking for and courting popularity, time-servers more than defenders of liberty[1]. And, in fine, we are told by another writer, that he is truly a rebel who resists the *King* or *his officers* in things appertaining to the state[2]. This is an important admission, so far as Charles I. is concerned, for it must be recollected, that the measures which he was compelled to adopt by his fanatical Parliaments, and those, in particular, on which I am now commenting, were not for his own advantage, but for the honour and service of the kingdom. And if the above facts, which seem to have been the general opinion of men in every age, are true, it will not be difficult

[1] "Inventi sunt nostro sæculo viri eruditi quidem illi, sed temporibus et locis nimium servientes, qui sibi primum (ita enim credo) deinde aliis persuaderent, ea quæ jam dicta sunt, locum habere in privatis, non etiam in magistratibus inferioribus, quibus jus esse putant resistendi injuriis ejus, cujus summum est imperium, imo et peccare eos, ni id faciant, *quæ opinio admittenda non est.* Nam omnis facultas gubernandi quæ est in magistratibus, summæ potestati ita subjicitur, ut quicquid contra voluntatem summi imperantis faciant, id defectum sit ea facultate, ac proinde pro actu privato habendum.—Ac mihi videntur qui contra sentiunt, talem statum rerum inducere, qualem antiqui fabulantur, in cœlo fuisse antequam Majestas oriretur, quo tempore aiunt minores Deos Jovi non concessisse." Grotius, ut sup. n. 6. etiam n. 8—14.

[2] Conradus, Imperat. de Præstantia et Potestate, lib. i. 12. Hence, St. Augustine, in explaining the apostolic injunction, says, "Necesse est propter hanc vitam nos subditos esse oportere, non resistentes si quid illi auferre voluerint."

to form an opinion of those factious men, who opposed their Sovereign, and fatally succeeded in overthrowing the altar and the throne.

And here it may be remarked, that these doctrines are not only built on the universal consent of all wise men of old, who may, perhaps, be charged by some as having imperfect notions of political relationship, yet who, nevertheless, had nothing to gain by such arguments, but they are, if we are to restrict ourselves to Christian times, founded on the plain and obvious interpretation of Scripture. For though I do not go so far as to say, that St. Paul and the other apostles inculcated political axioms, yet there is no warrant for the doctrine of resistance in the New Testament. For, first, our blessed Saviour himself set the example, by rigidly conforming in all things to the political government, as well as to the ecclesiastical; nor, when he was arraigned before the judgment-seat of Pilate, conscious as he was of innocence, because he was without sin, did he offer violence even to his persecutors, whose infamy is the more flagrant in proportion as the Saviour's conduct is considered. In his discourses to his apostles, he enjoined due submission in all things to authority[1]; and secondly,

[1] " In Novo Fœdere, Christus præcipiens dari Cæsari quæ Cæsaris sunt, intelligi voluit a suæ disciplinæ sectatoribus non minorem, si non majorem, obedientiam cum patientia (si opus sit) conjunctam summis potestatibus deberi, quam ab Hebræis regibus Hebræis debebatur: quod latius exsequens optimus ejus interpres Paulus Apostolus, officia subditorum late describens:

those apostles, especially St. Paul, enforced the injunctions of their Divine Master in still stronger and more decisive language [1].

I have thus entered a little into the merits of the famous doctrine of non-resistance, which the House of Stuart is infamously branded with enforcing, and which the Clergy of the Church of England, in the seventeenth century, are ignorantly and maliciously charged by sectaries with having inculcated from sinister motives; to shew those who delight in mere assertions, and who are deluded by a pretended liberality and patriotism, that the Clergy of the Church had the united voice of antiquity and of the primitive Church in their favour, as well as the authority of the great continental writers who flourished in that and the preceding centuries. I do not say that some of the positions of Sibthorpe

inter alia, 'Qui obsistit,' inquit 'potestati, Dei ordinationi obsistit: tum vero, qui obsistunt, sibi ipsis condemnationem accipient.' Addit mox, 'Dei enim minister est qui potestate fungitur tuo bono.' Deinde, 'Quapropter necesse est subjici, non istam propter iram, sed et propter conscientiam.' In subjectione includit resistendi necessitatem, neque eam solum quæ ex formidine majoris mali oritur, sed quæ ex ipso sensu officii nostri manat, neque hominibus tantum, sed et Deo nos obligat. Rationes addit duas, &c." Grotius, ut sup. n. 4.

[1] "Nam Apostolorum princeps subjectos nos esse vult aliter regi, aliter magistratibus: regi, ut supereminenti, id est, sine ulla exceptione, præter ea quæ Deus directe imperat, qui injuriæ patientiam probat, non interdicit: magistratibus, tanquam missis a rege, id est, potestatem suam a rege ducentibus. Et cum Paulus omnem animam supremis potestatibus esse subjectam vult, etiam magistratus inferiores inclusit." Grotius, ut sup. n. 6.

and Manwaring are generally true, and I have already admitted that they are against the principles of the British constitution; nevertheless, they are agreeable, in the abstract, to all the high authorities before referred to; but, were not even one of them true, still they are justifiable, inasmuch as it was policy to restrain the wild republicanism of the age, which was threatening so much danger to the state. There are many cases on which our modern liberalists expatiate eloquently, in which there is necessity for passive obedience; because, if the state rightly demands part of a man's property, he is remunerated by protection from foreign and domestic enemies: if the Church rightly demands it, in return he receives instruction, and, through the medium of the clergy, he is made a partaker of all the benefits of the Christian dispensation. So that, if passive obedience be an extreme, it is a much safer one than resistance: for the advocates of the latter have always proceeded to something, if not rebellious, at least seditious, as has been often exemplified in England, and particularly in Scotland, where, at an earlier period than this, John Knox and his adherents, stimulated by their personal hatred towards Mary, first engendered that wild enthusiasm, which afterwards desolated the kingdom, presumed to subscribe bonds, otherwise termed by them "covenants," in which was set forth, that, if even one of their number thought himself aggrieved, no matter what cause *he* had given, or the extent of his fault, the rest were to take up arms, and rebel

against the government; and this John Knox and his adherents termed zeal in defence of the true religion, and a care for their "oppressed brethren[1]." The authorities which I have adduced will not be thought lightly of, except by those sectarian enthusiasts who obstinately look with contempt on all human authority whatsoever, and who, acting on the pernicious principle which they have adopted in their lucubrations on the Scriptures, namely, *private interpretation*, against which principle a protest cannot be too often made in these pages, choose rather to trust to the impulses of their own conceited imaginations, than to pay homage and reverence to the names of those men, in comparison of whom the greatest men among *them* are the veriest pigmies, and whom, in fact, a secret jealousy, and a despair of successful rivalry, with an utter hopelessness of refutation, stimulate to treat the illustrious dead with opprobrium and contempt. While, however, it is admitted, that the preachers of whom I have lately spoken ought not to have introduced those themes into the pulpit; while, perhaps, the preaching of those doctrines at this time was impolitic; these concessions do not bear against the gene-

[1] Vide these bonds, disgraceful to the subscribers, in Knox's Historie, as they were subscribed at Ayr, Sept. 4, 1562, also Archbishop Spottiswoode's History. Bishop Keith's History, folio. Dr. Gilbert Stuart's History of Scotland, vol. i. and the enlightened remarks upon it by Dr. George Cook, (Minister of Laurence kirk,) in his History of the Scottish Reformation, vol. ii.

ral facts advocated in every age. And because Charles was resolved not to be a mere nominal King, but to be King in reality, he has been branded by enthusiasts as guilty of crimes, as being a tyrant, indulging in violent notions respecting his royal prerogative. Private hatred and malevolence have indeed assailed the character of this injured Monarch; they have misinterpreted his motives, and traduced his venerated name; but sound sense and true piety will spurn the calumnies of a faction, and will yet bear testimony to his many virtues, his gentleness, clemency, religion, and grateful affection towards his servants. It is not denied that Charles had his faults; that at times he was imprudent; and a superficial knowledge of his character may induce us to think him versatile and equivocating: but it will be found that his motives were laudable even when mistaken, and that in his actions he was under the control of circumstances, which, placed as he was, it was impossible for him to foresee. It was not his wish to become a tyrant over his people, he rather wished to secure their affection; but the opposition of a faction disturbed his peace, the violence of enthusiasm drove him to despair. The day, I trust, is not far distant when justice will be done to the memory of this injured Prince, and his unfortunate House.

Dr. Sibthorpe resolved to print his sermon, and having dedicated it to the King, he applied to Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to license its publication. This the Primate very unceremo-

niously refused to do, and his refusal at this particular period gave great offence to the Court. For, though he cannot be condemned for refusing to license a production which undeniably was against the spirit of the constitution, yet the peculiar situation of the King, and the intrigues of the opposing faction, ought to have induced him, if Sibthorpe was resolved on its publication, to license it after suggesting a few alterations. Abbot, however, was the patron of the faction, and it was not to be expected that he would sanction the sermon of a man who was no friend to the Puritan cause. The sermon was submitted to Laud's inspection, and after a number of alterations by him, it was licensed by Dr. George Montaigne, Bishop of London, dedicated to the King by its author, and published under the title of "Apostolical Obedience." Dr. Manwaring's two sermons were also published, under the title of "Allegiance and Religion," and we shall afterwards observe the persecution which their author encountered on that account [1].

[1] Dr. Heylin, (p. 158, 159.) obviously misled by Prynne, (Canterburie's Doome, p. 245.) to whom he indeed refers, seems to think that Laud had the principal share in the publication of this discourse. But this is not the case; for, though Laud certainly revised it, he had no concern in the publication, the principal alterations being made by the Bishop of London, which that Prelate adopted from the reasons assigned by Archbishop Abbot for refusing his licence, and which are to be found in the Primate's own narrative, Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. part i. p. 436—445, where his reasons are detailed at length; but, it must be admitted, that in this instance Abbot was unjustly

Archbishop Abbot had long declined in the King's favour. The infirmities of age precluded him from attending the meetings of the privy council, and his leaning towards Puritanism also produced in him a dislike to associate with those whom he had always opposed. His refusal, however, to license Sibthorpe's sermon prompted the Court to take decisive measures, and it was injudiciously resolved to punish him for his contumacy. A commission of sequestration was accordingly issued against him, and the administration of his metropolitan functions was put into the hands of Laud, in conjunction with

treated, because those reasons are, on the whole, not only prudent, but even unobjectionable. Prynne declares that Laud licensed the sermon, which *he* knew very well was false, for Dr. Montaigne's imprimatur is affixed to it, (Rushworth, vol. i. p. 444.) and he declares also, that Sibthorpe had "sweetened his sour theme," by "cunningly inserting some popular passages into this sermon against evil counsellors, the toleration of Papists, Popery, and the profanation of the Sabbath, which the Bishop, who procured this sermon of his to be printed, expunged with his own hand, as was evidenced by the original written copy found in his study, produced at the Lords' bar, and attested by Master Prynne." He then enumerates the passages which he says were expunged, in his usual ill-arranged and verbose manner. But it was easy for "Master Prynne" to mutilate Laud's papers as he pleased, and we know that he did do so, after he had most illegally taken possession of them, as I shall shew in the sequel; and to produce whatever evidence he pleased at the "Lords' bar." Laud himself, Diary, p. 41, merely says, that he had seen the Archbishop's exceptions; but it is undeniable, that whatever passages were expunged, were not done by Laud; nor are we to take "Master Prynne's" *ipse dixit* for the fact.

the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, and Oxford [1].

There have been various opinions entertained respecting the true cause of the Archbishop's disgrace. His conduct had made him unacceptable to the King, though it had secured to him the favour of the Puritans. The Church historian asserts, that the charge of irregularity, which the Primate had incurred by the death of Lord Zouch's game-keeper, was revived, and that the proceedings against him were generally condemned as too rigid and severe [2]. Heylin, on the other hand, asserts, that Abbot was suspended on account of his laxity of discipline. "The King," says he, "could not but see by the practices and proceedings of the former Parliament, to what a prevalency the Puritans had attained in all parts of the kingdom, and how incompatible that humour was with the regal interest. There was no need to tell him from what fountain the mischief came, how much the popularity and remiss government of Abbot did contribute towards it; therefore

[1] Diary, p. 41. The names of the other Bishops were Dr. Montaigne, Dr. Neile, Dr. Buckeridge, and Dr. Houson. The Commission is inserted in Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 740, Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 431, 432, 433. Prynne's Breviat, p. 11, 12. Frankland's Annals, p. 211.

[2] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 127, 128. Prynne's Breviat, p. 11. who maliciously says, that the commission was "Laud's own procurement, in malice and envy against Archbishop Abbot, for his casual homicide of the keeper, in shooting at a buck, many years after the fact was done."

he sequestered him from his metropolitan jurisdiction [1]." While others again have held, with perhaps greater truth, that the real cause was his refusal to license Sibthorpe's sermon [2].

The Archbishop himself was of the last opinion. Indeed, the irregularity occasioned by the death of the game-keeper was never afterwards remembered, and, therefore, the reasons assigned by the Church historian fall to the ground, more particularly as in the commission of sequestration there is no notice taken of the casual homicide, which could not have been mentioned, because Abbot had since that event, a period of seven years, (besides being completely cleared of the charge, both by the judgment of Laud and the other persons appointed to inquire into it, and by a dispensation issued under the Great Seal [3]), all along exercised his archiepiscopal functions [4]. The commission merely sets forth, that

[1] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 161.

[2] L'Estrange's Reign of Charles I. p. 70. 72. Collier, vol. ii. p. 741, 742. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 178.

[3] Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. ii. p. 721.

[4] Another error of the Puritan historian must here be corrected. In animadverting on Abbot's sequestration, he says, "his Grace had a royal dispensation to shelter him from the canons, and had ever since exercised his jurisdiction without interruption, *even to the consecration of Laud himself to a bishopric*." Now, if Neal had examined, he would have found, that, in his haste to give Abbot's jurisdiction greater effect, he overshot the mark; for Laud was not consecrated by Abbot, as I have already shewn, but in the Bishop of London's chapel, along with the bishops-elect of Salisbury and Exeter, by the

" the Archbishop cannot at this present, in his own person, attend to the services which are otherwise proper for his cognizance and jurisdiction [1]." There is no specific reason assigned, but Abbot knew well the cause; for he says in his own narrative, " Hitherto I have declared at length all passages concerning the sermon, and I have not, to my remembrance, quitted any thing worth knowing. I am now, in the second place, to shew, what was the issue of thus not allowing the worthy and learned treatise [2]. In the height of this question, I privately

Bishops of London, Worcester, Ely, Oxford, and Llandaff, because the bishops-elect, though they cleared Abbot of the irregularity, still scrupled to receive consecration from him, and those five prelates were appointed as a commission by James to proceed with the duty. Bishop Hacket's Life of Archbishop Williams, p. 68.

[1] Collier asks, and justly, " Why could he not attend them? Because his Majesty was displeased, and would not permit him." So, forsooth, does Neal. " But why should he not attend them?" asks the Puritan historian. " Because his Majesty had commanded him to retire, for refusing to license Sibthorpe's sermon."

[2] The Archbishop here talks ironically, for in one place he calls it " highly improper and absurd, worthy of none but Dr. Sibthorpe," to whom, by the way, he bore a mortal hatred; and in another place he calls it " a contemptible treatise." It may not be improper here to notice, what the Archbishop says of Sibthorpe. " There was one Sibthorpe, who, not being so much as Bachelor of Arts, as hath been credibly reported unto me, by means of Dr. Pierce, Dean of Peterborough, Vice-chancellor of Oxford, did get to be conferred upon him the title of Doctor. This man is Vicar of Brackley, in Northamptonshire, and hath another benefice not far from it in Bucks. But the lustre of his

understood from a friend in the court, that, *for a punishment upon me*, it was resolved that I should be sent away to Canterbury, and confined there[1]." It cannot be denied that the offence did not merit any punishment; but, as Collier wisely remarks, "the good King was misdirected into these rigours, and believed himself in the right."

Many complaints, however, had been made against the Archbishop at court, some of them too well founded, and he was made aware of them by his friends. He retired to Croydon before his usual time, and now old and infirm, anticipating the effects of the King's displeasure. On the 5th of July he was visited by Lord Conway, the Secretary of State, who informed him that it was the King's pleasure he should retire to Canterbury. To this he objected, because he said that he had at that time a law-suit depending in that city, and desired rather that he should be allowed to retire to Ford, five miles from Canterbury, which was granted; and on the 9th of October the commission to exercise his episcopal functions was issued to Laud and the other bishops before mentioned. He did not, however, remain long in his seclusion, for the King being compelled soon afterwards to summon a Par-

honours did accrue from his being the son-in-law of Sir John Lamb, Chancellor of Peterborough. He being a man of low fortune, conceived that the putting his sermon in print might gain favour at court, and raise his fortune higher." Rushworth, vol. i. p. 436.

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 445.

liament, he was invited to Court about the ensuing Christmas, and was not only restored to his metropolitan jurisdiction, but was received by the Archbishop of York and the Earl of Dorset at Whitehall stairs, as he quitted his barge from Lambeth palace, by whom he was led to the King, and having kissed hands, he was requested to attend the council twice a week. He sat in the ensuing Parliament, and was not interrupted in the exercise of his authority till his death. And that there were no farther exceptions taken as to his regularity, is evident from the circumstance, that he consecrated Dr. Richard Montague, (the author of the famous book already noticed, who had shewn him no slight opposition,) Bishop of Chichester, and at this consecration he was assisted by Laud[1].

In these transactions, however, Laud by no means escaped the insinuations of his enemies, and there were not a few who asserted, that he was impatient for the death of the aged Primate, that he might succeed in the metropolitan see. Fuller, while at the same time he confesses that the Archbishop's own contumacy in opposing the court measures, made him the more obnoxious to his enemies, mentions the opinion, first sent abroad, doubtless, by the Puritan faction, that "the blame did most alight on Bishop Laud, even accounting this a kind of *Filius ante diem*, &c.; as if not content to succeed,

[1] Life of Archbishop Williams, p. 68, Archbishop Abbot's own Narrative, apud Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 445, &c.

he endeavoured to supplant him, who might well have suffered his decayed old age to have died in honour." To the same effect Neal asserts, that "Laud was desirous to step into the archiepiscopal chair, while Abbot was yet alive[1]." But there is not the slightest ground for the insinuation; for though Laud saw and lamented Abbot's unhappy primacy, and though he might naturally wish, now that he was certain of succeeding, that a man should be removed who was rendering his own administration more difficult, yet it is undeniable that Laud did no more than the other bishops in the case; and the fact on which his enemies insist is merely the slight notice in his Diary, that Buckingham had intimated to him the King's intentions on Abbot's decease. Abbot himself had not the slightest belief in this report, otherwise he would not have failed to gratify his resentment against Laud, by recording it. He imputes his disgrace solely to the Duke of Buck-

[1] I here correct another falsehood of Neal. He says, (p. 176.) that "Abbot's jurisdiction was put into the hands of five bishops, by commission, of whom Laud was the chief." I must confess that the original document is more worthy of credit than Neal, and it is there stated, *thrice* by the King, that he "nominates, authorizes, and appoints" the said "George, Lord Bishop of London; Richard, Lord Bishop of Durham; John, Lord Bishop of Rochester; John, Lord Bishop of Oxford; and William, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, *or any four, three, or two* of them, to do, execute, and appoint," &c. Collier, vol. ii. p. 741. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 432, 433. Even Prynne, Breviat, p. 12, has honesty enough for once not to mutilate that document.

ingham, who laid hold of this opportunity to mortify him, because he had not evinced towards him due respect: "it being brought unto the Duke," says he, "it cometh into his head, or was suggested to him by some malicious person, that thereby the Archbishop might be put to some remarkable strait[1]:" and though he has indulged in an invective against Laud, and even notices his intimacy with Buckingham, calling him his "inward counsellor," yet he clearly shews that it was not till *after* offence had been taken by the court, till *after* he had refused his licence, that Laud took any active share; and his part consisted only in replies to some of Abbot's exceptions, in which he was assisted by the Bishops of Durham, Rochester, and Oxford[2]. And here I may observe, that Abbot's testimony sufficiently exposes the malice of Prynne's falsehood; for whereas that enthusiast asserts, that Laud struck out the *only pious passages* in the whole sermon, it is clear, that if any passages were omitted, the Bishop of London has the merit of them, for Abbot himself declares, that "when the approbation of the sermon was by me refused, it was carried to the Bishop of London, who gave a grave and stately allowance for it, the good man being not willing that any thing should stick, which was sent unto him from the court, as appears by the book which

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 436. Collier, vol. ii. p. 742.

[2] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 440.

is commonly called the Seven Sacraments[1], which was allowed by his Lordship, with all the errors which, since that time, have been expunged." How far this agrees with the following passage from Prynne, will be easily seen: "These being (Prynne enumerates them) the only pious, orthodox passages in all this sermon, against Popery, Papists, Sabbath-breaking, and evil counsellors, were quite crossed out with the Bishop's (Laud's) own hand, who altered and added many things in it for the worse, and all for this very purpose, that the people might not take

[1] The Archbishop here refers to a book written by Dr. Cozens, one of the Prebendaries of Durham, entitled "A Collection of Private Devotions, or, the House of Prayer," which, it is supposed, was written chiefly for the benefit of the Countess of Denbigh, sister to the Duke of Buckingham, who was beginning to waver in her attachment to the Protestant religion. It professed to be framed agreeably to the private prayers authorized in 1560, by Queen Elizabeth. It retained several Popish titles to the different divisions, which startled the enthusiasts of those days, who imagined that there was nothing good at Rome, but that Papists were utterly to be abhorred, and every thing which belongs to them. Dr. Montaigne licensed it, and its very appearance excited the Puritan fanaticism, because it bore resemblance to some of the Popish effusions, having on the top of the frontispiece the well-known abbreviation J. H. S. with a cross upon it, irradiated by the sun, and supported by two angels. It was attacked by Prynne, and Henry Burton, the former of whom wrote what he called "A Brief Survey and Censure of Cozens his cozening Devotions, anno 1628," in which he charged it with being entirely Popish. The book, however, we are informed by Heylin, got exceedingly popular, notwithstanding all the Puritan clamour. Heylin, p. 164, 165.

notice of any design in foreign parts to extirpate the Protestant religion, or to tolerate, set up Popery, or suspend the laws against it, or Papists, Priests, and Sabbath-breakers at home, whereof these clauses gave them notice; which this Doctor (Sibthorpe) bad as he was, foresaw would produce that division in our kingdom, under which we now experimentally suffer, threatening utter desolation to us. All these purgations in one sermon were made by this pragmatical prelate, before he had any legal power to license books for the press[1]."

In the midst of these disputes between the royalists and the factious enthusiasts, affairs of state occupied the attention of the court. The intentions of the King were most maliciously misrepresented, and it was said, as Prynne asserts in the above extract, that there was an intention to establish the Popish interest in Europe; whereas it was well known, that while the King was striving to restrain the Puritan faction at home, he was openly encouraging the Hugonots, the French Puritans, abroad; nay, it was notorious, that the loan which the King was forced to raise, was for the defence of Protestantism, to assist the King of Denmark, who had

[1] Canterburie's Doom, p. 246. In another place, this charitable champion of conventicles says, "But since Providence hath brought it to public light, we conceive it will be a very good precedent to direct your Lordships' judgment in the sentence of this *Haman*, this *arch-malefactor against our state and religion*." It is at times amusing to perceive the fierceness with which this enthusiast maintains his notion that Laud was a Papist.

brought himself into trouble by opposing the King of Spain, and defending the Palatinate[1]. At the instigation of Buckingham, as Lord Clarendon alleges, within a month after the dissolution of the last Parliament, Charles found himself engaged in a war with France, and the Duke went in person to conduct the expedition to Rochelle, which proved unsuccessful, more from the conduct of the Parliament, who had not granted the King his necessary supplies, than from any deficiency of courage in the Duke[2]. The spirit of discontent was

[1] The Puritan historian denies this in his usual magisterial manner. "When one considers the characters of this King and his ministry, we can hardly believe that this could be the real motive for the war, for his Majesty and his whole court had a mortal aversion to the French Hugonots." This, however, is not the fact, and though it was, it does not involve the King's sincerity. The Grand Seignior has been frequently the defender of Christianity, the Pope has been the promoter of Protestantism, and so, at certain times, have been the French and Spanish monarchs. He then goes on to state, "Buckingham had no religion at all, Weston and Conway were Catholics, Laud and Neile thought there was no salvation out of the Church of England. How then can it be supposed that they should make war for the support of a religion for which they had the utmost contempt?" (vol. ii. p. 178.) Neal would have done well to have perused Laud's own words, before he penned the last clause. "The Catholic Church of Christ," says that great Prelate, "is neither Rome nor a conventicle. Out of that there is no salvation, I candidly confess it; but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too. Salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave."

[2] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. fol. edit.

excited in the nation by the exertions of the Puritan leaders, who were the avowed enemies of Buckingham. Nor were the Duke's endeavours at the Isle of Rhé, of which, being situated over against Rochelle, he was anxious to obtain possession, as thereby he would be enabled to relieve the inhabitants of Rochelle from their blockade, attended with better success. Five thousand men were lost in that disastrous attempt, the English forces were beaten, and the Duke was forced to retreat to his vessels. The murmurs of the nation were now louder and more significant, and Charles himself was secretly convinced that they were just; for it was evident, that though the Duke's personal courage was well known, he was more adapted for the court than the camp. He was possessed of resources sufficient, both at land and sea, to have rendered his success certain, had he followed up the slight advantage he gained at his first landing, by instantly attacking the fort, and not suffering himself to be amused by the enemy. It is no doubt true, as the Duke urged in his own defence, that he had acted not on his own responsibility, but by the advice of a council of war, and that he depended on the Earl of Holland advancing with a supply of shipping and provisions, which, had he obtained, he would have forced the garrison to capitulate by a blockade. But Holland excused himself by declaring, that when he was ready to embark, the vessels had not arrived at Portsmouth, and that the winds were so adverse when he was ready to sail, as to restrain him from

putting out to sea. It was evident, however, that the misfortune was great, and the murmurs of the people daily increased. "The mariners," says the noble historian, "came in crowds to Whitehall in great disorder and confusion, crying out for pay, and hardly to be appeased;" and it was the universal demand of the nation, that a Parliament should be called[1]. Even before the affair was determined, the most seditious rumours were in circulation. It was declared by many, that matters were not well conducted at the Isle of Rhé; that there must be a Parliament; that *some* must be sacrificed, and Bishop Laud was as likely as any, his offence, in the

[1] Clarendon's Hist. vol. i. fol. edit. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 426, 462—467. Heylin, p. 159, 160. Laud's Diary, p. 42. Breviat, p. 13. Sir H. Wotton's Life of Buckingham, p. 20. Strafford's Letters and State Papers, vol. i. p. 510. It is remarkable, however, that the inhabitants of Rochelle, who were then in the greatest difficulties, do not allege any mismanagement on the part of the Duke. After his arrival in England, they thanked the King, by their deputies, for the great assistance the Duke had rendered to them, (Rushworth, vol. i. p. 467.) which, they said, would have been greater, had the season of the year been in their favour, and had the Duke received his supply of ammunition and provisions. After beseeching the King and the Privy Council to take their circumstances into consideration, they "declare that they are still resolved to hold out, hoping that a relief would yet come that might be of advantage to them, and they were assured thereof by the Duke of Buckingham at his departure, that he would once more come in person to their assistance." Rushworth, ut sup. p. 467. Lansdowne MSS. Plut. Harleian MSS. Collection of State Papers, ut sup.

opinion of those enthusiasts, being unpardonable, namely, his intimacy with the Duke. These accusations were reported to Laud, who told them to the King; but the Monarch nobly replied, "Let me desire you not to trouble yourself with any reports, *till you see me forsake my friends*[1]."

Laud, in the meanwhile, had acted with his accustomed dignity and diligence in the discharge of his episcopal duties, sedulously labouring for the welfare of the Church. On the 29th of April he had been made a privy counsellor, along with his great friend and patron, Bishop Neile. Here Laud's conduct reflects on him distinguished honour. He was not ungrateful to that excellent prelate for the patronage he had bestowed on him in early life. It was through him that he had been recommended to James I. Neile's interest with the King had defeated the calumnies of Laud's enemies, and now, when Neile had not a few in array against himself, and when, had Laud been a worldly prelate, he might have been troubled at the thoughts of a jealous rivalry; he displayed his gratitude by his attention to his venerable patron, who had always been to him as a father and a friend. But the stability of the Church was the object of Laud's constant solicitude; he saw it to be the bulwark of the Protestant Reformation, and he was not disposed to indulge the petty jealousies of self-interest, or to be

[1] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 462. Diary, p. 42. Breviat, p. 13. Well would it have been for Charles had he remembered this in Strafford's case.

forgetful of obligations previously conferred. On the 7th of June he attended the King at Portsmouth, and on the 17th he received the promise of the bishopric of London.

The removal of Bishop Laud from Bath and Wells to London was what Charles had long contemplated; for though much wealthier Sees than that of London had become, or were likely soon to become vacant, there was none which required a greater degree of vigilance and efficient government. The See of London, by far more important, perhaps, than any other, demanded the exercise of the greatest wisdom and prudence in its management; and more especially because its duties are more laborious, for, besides the City parishes, and those without the Walls, its jurisdiction extends over the counties of Middlesex and Essex, part of Herefordshire, comprehending the Archdeaconry of St. Alban's. No sinecure, indeed, is the diocese of London, and no diocese in the kingdom has greater claims to be divided. In the reign of Henry VIII. that measure was adopted; a Bishop of Westminster had been appointed in the thirty-second year of that monarch's reign; and by letters patent, bearing date Dec. 17, 1540, the church of St. Peter was erected into a cathedral, Westminster became a city, the county of Middlesex, with the exception of Fulham, where is the Bishop of London's palace, was allotted for the diocese, and Dr. Thomas Thirlby, the first and only bishop, was consecrated on the 19th of December. That prelate occupied the new diocese, erected by

the dissolution of the Abbey, for ten years, when he was translated to Norwich, April 1, 1550; and Edward VI. that very day, in the fourth year of his reign, again annexed the new diocese to that of London, and an Act of Parliament was not long after passed, appointing the church of St. Peter "a corporation and body politic," to consist of a dean and twelve prebendaries, under the name of the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster[1]. It had been the wish of Cranmer, that venerable father of the Church of England, to appropriate a great part of the revenues of the dissolved abbeys and monasteries for the foundation of new bishoprics, as well as of schools, and other endowments; but the zeal of the dissenters in gratifying the rapacity of Henry VIII. frustrated the intentions of the Church, and allowed him to fill his coffers with that wealth, which, had it passed into the hands of the Reformers, as the legitimate successors of the Popish dignitaries, would have been of advantage to the nation, and beneficial to the promotion of learning. The dioceses, therefore, continued, excepting some new foundations, as they were; and few can estimate the severe duties which the bishops were often called to perform. But in the nomination of Laud to the See of London, Charles had a great object in view, more especially in his contemplated translations. Dr. Mon-

[1] Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, folio, London, 1716. p. 363.

taigne was not dead, but he, though otherwise a good man, was inactive in the administration of his diocese. As Heylin well remarks, the King naturally reckoned London to be "the retreat and receptacle of the grandees of the Puritan faction: the influence which it had, by reason of its wealth and trading in all parts of the kingdom; and that, upon the correspondence and conformity thereof, the welfare of the whole depended: no better way, then, to make them an example of obedience to the rest of the kingdom, than by placing over them a bishop of such talents and power as they should not be able to withstand, or anxious to offend."

In his contemplated changes the King was actuated solely by his regard for the Church. Winchester, then vacant by the death of that excellent prelate, Dr. Launcelot Andrews, was intended for Dr. Neile, who was in the See of Durham; but the Court necessities, as has been remarked, urged a delay in the appointment, which gave rise to reports injurious to the King[1]. But in the December of

[1] The calumny circulated was, that the King intended the See for a younger son of the Queen of Bohemia, who was to possess it by the title of Administrator, as was sometimes done on the Continent. Heylin, p. 166. Yet Winchester was little more than a year and a half vacant, which was but half the time of two former periods: for it was vacant three years after the death of Bishop Walkelyne, in 1097, who had no successor till Bishop William Gifford was appointed in 1100: and again, after the death of Henry de Blois, brother to King Stephen, who died in 1171, it was vacant for the like period. Le Neve's Fasti, p. 284.

this year the vacant diocese was filled up by Bishop Neile's translation. It was intended to remove Dr. Montaigne to Durham, but that prelate himself opposed it, not liking the great distance from court, at which he had been long accustomed to reside [1]. He was, however, translated, though only nominally; for, in the midst of these delays, Dr. Toby Matthews, Archbishop of York, died on the 29th of May, 1627, at Cawood Castle, in which archiepiscopal see he had sat with no small reputation since the year 1606 [2]. This dignity was of more

[1] "In Montaigne's hands," says Heylin, in a tone of exquisite satire, "the business received a stop. He had spent a great part of his life in the air of a court, as Chaplain to Robert Earl of Salisbury, Dean of Westminster, (Le Neve, p. 364.) and Bishop Almoner, and had lived for many years past in the warm city of London. To remove him so far from Court, and send him into those cold regions of the north, he looked upon as the worst kind of banishment, next neighbour to a civil death. But having a long while strived in vain, and understanding that his Majesty was not well pleased with his delays, he began to set forward on that journey, with this proviso notwithstanding, that the utmost term of his removal should be from London House in the City to Durham House in the Strand."

[2] This distinguished Prelate, whose eldest son, Sir Toby Matthews, made a very distinguished figure in this reign, was descended from an ancient Welsh family named Williams. He was born at Bristol, in 1546, educated at the school of Wells, sent to Oxford at thirteen years of age, and entered student of Christ Church. After taking his degrees, he was admitted into holy orders by the famous Dr. Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, and, in 1569, when only twenty-three years of age, he was chosen public orator in the University. He became famous for his uncommon eloquence as a preacher. He was very soon pre-

consequence to Dr. Montaigne than the diocese of Durham, and he now evinced as much anxiety for

ferred. In 1570, he was made Canon of Christ Church, and Archdeacon of Bath. In 1572, Prebend of Sarum, President of St. John's College, and Queen's Chaplain, and, in 1576, Dean of Christ Church. In 1579, he became Vice-chancellor of Oxford, and, in 1583, Precentor of Salisbury; but in the year following, being appointed Dean of Durham, he resigned the Precentorship and the Deanery of Christ Church. He left the University, though he had powerful friends at court, and proceeded to the Diocese of Durham, where he was so diligent in the discharge of his duties, that it is said of him that he preached from the pulpit of almost every town in the county, in some places repeatedly, while he was Dean, nor did he relax in his duties when he became Bishop of that see in 1595. He became Archbishop of York in 1606, and from that time till his death he was universally respected. His monument is still to be seen at the east end of York Minster. He preached with indefatigable diligence to the very last, whence the remark of Cook, vicar of Leeds, in Yorkshire, in his "Popish Brags Abated," that "Tobye Matthewes, the Most Rev. Archbishop of York, though almost 80 years of age, preacheth more sermons in a year, than you can prove has been preached by all your Popes from Gregory the Great his days." Campian, the Jesuit, (*Rationes Decem*, &c. printed in 1581, and 1583, and translated into English in 1687,) says of him, "He that now rules in your pulpits, *qui nunc dominatus in concionibus*, adding, "*quem propter bonas artes et virtutis semina dileximus.*" Notwithstanding his frequent public preaching, he neglected not his other episcopal duties, frequently confirming 500 and 1000 persons at a time, besides his visitations, ordinations, &c. Camden says of him, "*Theologus præstantissimus, in quo doctrina cum pietate, ars cum natura, certant,*" and Wood observes of him, "Infinitæ propemodum lectionis vir librum pene nullum, quem vel scriptoris fama vel ipsum operis argumentum commendaret, intactum prætermisit, memoriam quoque tam tenacem habuit, ut

his translation thither, as he had before shewn reluctance to quit the See of London. He was successful in attaining his wish, though, in the mean time, some small delay was occasioned in Laud's translation from Bath and Wells. Notwithstanding the anxiety which Dr. Montaigne displayed to gain his object, it appears that he did not long survive his translation to York. Such is the vanity of human ambition[1]!

These arrangements, however, were not completed for some time, and the King's necessities at length compelled him to call a Parliament. On the 29th of January, 1627-8, a resolution was passed by the Privy Council to that effect, and the third Parliament was summoned to meet on the 17th of March, 1627-8. Preparatory to that meeting, the King ordered all those persons to be set at liberty who had been confined for non-compliance with the loan, expecting that by this clemency he would allay

legenti sese paucissima obtulerint, quæ vir, si quando usus flagitaret, confestim proferret." None of his sermons have appeared in print, except his "Concio Apologetica contra Campianum in Deut. xxii. 7," printed in 1581, and again at Oxford in 1628. Wood, Athen. vol. i. col. 105. 109, 110. 428. 730, 731. Vicaria Leodiensis, p. 165. 167. 169, 170. Camden's Brit. in Brig. folio, vol. ii. Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 133.

[1] Dr. Mountaigne died Oct. 24, 1628. He was at first Bishop of Lincoln, and then translated to London, and when in the latter see, he was wont to remark, "Lincoln was, London is, and York shall be," which was verified; "through which sees," says Fuller, "never any prelate passed so methodically as himself." Worthies of Yorkshire, p. 199. Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, lib. xiv. p. 523.

the murmurs of the Puritan faction. Whatever were the expectations of the King, however, he was disappointed, and the measure at this juncture was impolitic, the clemency misplaced; for, had Charles kept those zealots still in confinement, it is not improbable that the Parliament, freed from their inflammatory insinuations, would have adopted such measures as might have conciliated the court. For these men, it must be observed, were confined not merely for refusing compliance with the loan, but for the outrageous insolence which they had exhibited, and the seditious rumours which they had industriously circulated. To grant them their liberty, while in prison they had been fortifying themselves in their dogmatic and republican opposition, was, in effect, to give them permission to renew their practices. They were looked upon by the faction as the noblest champions of liberty, and they were not slow to increase their popularity among the people, by recounting the sufferings which they pretended to have endured. So that those who desired it were returned as members of the Lower House, being preferred above all others; and, actuated by revenge, they were determined to increase their opposition to the King.

But before I proceed to notice the affairs of this Parliament, perhaps I shall be pardoned for introducing the following extract from Dr. Heylin, which is interesting, inasmuch as we obtain from it a complete insight into Laud's private conduct. The Bishop has recorded in his Diary, that on the 5th

of February before the meeting of the Parliament, as he went with the King to Hampton Court, he strained the back sinew of his right leg, which confined him till the opening of the Parliament. Heylin, as has been already observed, was contemporary with Laud, and was intimately acquainted with him, having been born in the year 1600; and he survived the Restoration, dying on the 8th of May, 1662[1]. "During the time of the Bishop's confinement," says that learned writer, "I had both the happiness of being taken into his special knowledge of me, and the opportunity of a longer conference with him than I could otherwise have expected. I went to present my service to him as he was preparing for this journey (to attend the King), and was appointed to attend him on the same day seven-night, when I might presume on his return. Coming precisely at that time, I heard of his misfortune, and that he kept himself to his chamber; but orders had been given to the servants, that if I came, he should be made acquainted with it; which being done accordingly, I was brought into his chamber, where I found him sitting in a chair, with his lame leg resting on a pillow. Commanding that no person should come to interrupt him till he called, he caused me to sit down by him, inquired first into the course of my studies, which he well approved of, exhorting me to continue in that moderate course in which he found me. He afterwards discoursed on some affairs at

[1] Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, lib. xiv. p. 542.

Oxford, in which I was specially concerned, and told me thereupon the story of such oppositions as he had experienced in that University from Archbishop Abbot and some others; encouraged me not to shrink, if I had already, or should hereafter, experience the same. I was with him thus, *remotis arbitris*, almost two hours. It passed towards twelve o'clock, and then he knocked for his servants to come unto him. He caused me to stay dinner with him, and used me with no small respect, which was remarked by some gentlemen; Elphinston, one of his Majesty's cup-bearers, being one of the company who dined with him[1]." This incident is indeed trivial in itself, but every relick of a great man is valuable, and ought to be preserved with pious care.

On the 17th of March, 1627-8, the third Parliament of Charles assembled. Oliver Cromwell, then a person of no distinction, was one of its members, and took an active part in its proceedings. Laud preached the opening sermon, (the sixth in his printed volume,) from Ephes. iv. 3. "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." This sermon, which is an admirable specimen of his impassioned eloquence and solid reasoning, and which abounds in advices and exhortations truly apostolic, was commanded by the King to be printed; and had the faction in the House of Commons studied it as well as they did the effusions of their own

[1] Heylin, p. 167.

fanatical teachers, they would have received from it important lessons of duty. But they had a deeply cherished hatred towards the man, and, therefore, they concluded that "no good thing could come out of Nazareth." After the conclusion of the sermon, Charles opened the Parliament in a speech from the throne, addressed to both Houses, to the following effect:

"My Lords and Gentlemen. These times are for action; wherefore, for example's sake, I mean not to spend much time in words; expecting accordingly, that your, as I hope, good resolutions will be speedy, not spending time unnecessarily, or, as I may better say, dangerously; for tedious consultations at this time are as hurtful as ill regulations.

"I am sure you expect from me to know both the cause of your meeting, and what to resolve on. Yet I think there is none here, but knows that common danger is the cause of this Parliament, and that supply at this time is the chief end of it; so that I need but point out to you what to do. I will use but few persuasions. For if to maintain your own advice, and (as now the case standeth by the following thereof,) the true religion, laws, liberties of the state, and the just defence of our true friends and allies, be not sufficient, no eloquence of man or angel will persuade.

"Only let me remind you, that my duty most of all, and every one of yours, according to his degree, is to seek the maintenance of this Church and Commonwealth, and certainly there was never a time in

which this duty was more necessarily required than now.

" I, therefore, judging a Parliament to be the most ancient, speediest, and best way in this time of common danger, to give such supply as to secure ourselves, and to save our friends from imminent ruin, have called you together. Every man must do according to his conscience. Wherefore if you, (which God forbid) should not do your duty, which the state at this time needs, I must in discharge of my conscience use those other means which God hath put into my hands, to save that which the folly of particular men may otherwise hazard to lose. Take not this as a threatening, (for I scorn to threaten any but my equals), but as an admonition from him, that both out of nature and duty hath most care of your preservations and prosperities. And I hope, though I thus speak, that your demeanour at this time will be such as shall not only approve your former counsels, but lay on me such obligations as shall tie me by way of thankfulness to meet often with you. For be assured, that nothing can be more pleasing to me than to keep a good correspondence with you.

" I will only add one thing more, and then leave the Keeper to make a short paraphrase upon the text I have delivered unto you, which is, to remember a thing, to the end you may forget it. You may imagine I come here with a doubt of good success of what I desire, remembering the distractions at the last meeting. But I assure you, that I shall

very easily and gladly forget and forgive what is past, so that you will at this time leave the former ways of distraction, and follow the counsel lately given you, *to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace* [1]."

Such is the speech which Charles delivered at the opening of this Parliament, at the end of which he refers to Laud's masterly sermon, and I have thought it worthy of a place here, as it is a comment on the proceedings of the two former Parliaments, and as it pourtrays that noble independence and manly eloquence for which that Prince was distinguished. The Lord Keeper, then, in turn, addressed the two Houses, and brought before them the state of affairs both at home and abroad, directed their attention to the political intrigues of their continental enemies, and concluded by advising them to assist the King with due alacrity in the present emergency.

But, as formerly, this was of little use. A few of the leading enthusiasts had succeeded in securing partisans, some of them factious like themselves, others well affected indeed towards the King, but misled by their false representations. They, therefore, resolved to manage their own business first, that is, to have their own way, and take the King into their own hands. It first moved them to appoint a fast day [2], which being done, (for nothing could be done without making such a display of

[1] Lansdowne MSS. Parl. Col. 1620—1628. 498. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 476, 477.

[2] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 498, 499.

their zeal,) they forthwith entreated the House of Lords, after debating concerning their liberties, (in which Sibthorpe and Manwaring were duly noticed as two prating sycophants,) to unite with them in a petition against the toleration of Papists. This was agreed to, and on the 31st of March it was presented to the King, who, while he commended them for their zeal in religion, still pressed upon their consideration the affairs of state [1]. It behoved them, however, to take various things into consideration before they thought fit to agree: they were first to ascertain whether they were able to vote any supplies, and then it was their business to inquire whether they were to be considered as slaves or freemen, of which they pretended to have doubts, on account of the late imprisonment of their members. But, after a variety of altercations, they resolved to leave the King's business for the present, that is, those state affairs on which they were professedly called to legislate, and to proceed in their own way.

The Commons first attacked their old enemy the Duke of Buckingham, whom, on the 11th of June, they voted to be the principal cause of all the calamities brought on the King and kingdom, and they accordingly presented a remonstrance of grievances against him [2]. But, on the 16th of June, the King

[1] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 515.

[2] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 617. 619—626.

issued an order, that the process preferred against the Duke in the Star-Chamber should be discharged, being conscious of his innocence, and the subsequent prorogation of the Parliament delayed the effect of the remonstrance. Having thus noticed the Duke, Dr. Manwaring was not forgotten, and it was determined to punish him for his two sermons, in which they implicated Laud, who had licensed them for the press. After various harangues from the members of the House, among whom the enthusiast Prynne particularly distinguished himself, Manwaring was called before them; and after extorting from him an humble submission and "acknowledgment of the many errors and indiscretions he had committed," and compelling him to "beg pardon of God, the King, the Honourable House, the Church, and the Commonwealth in general, and those *worthy persons* adjudged to be reflected on by him in particular, for these great errors and offences," they sentenced him to be imprisoned during their pleasure, to pay 1000*l.* to the King, to be suspended from preaching for three years, to be disabled from holding any ecclesiastical dignity, to be prohibited ever afterwards from preaching at court; and ordered that his sermons, being worthy to be burnt, should be called in by proclamation, committed to the flames, and never again printed under a great penalty [1].

From this sentence it will be seen that the *friends*

[1] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 605. Collier, vol. ii. p. 744. Heylin, p. 170.

of liberty were by no means lenient in their decisions. But the sentence is liable to the severest reprobation, for Manwaring had committed no crime against the State; and, although his positions were absurd, they were rather errors of judgment than deliberate faults. His offence did not even amount to petty treason, or misprision of treason, seeing that these are only to be understood when committed *against the King's person and authority:* hence, therefore, the House of Commons had no right to sit as judges in this case, any more than to inflict the fine after his impeachment. The fine and imprisonment, if found guilty of crimes against the state, were all that they had a right to inflict as a civil court of legislature: but Manwaring was amenable first to the King, as supreme ecclesiastical ruler, and secondly to his superiors in the Church, if he had taught any thing contrary to the doctrine of that Church, whose duty and right it was to decide whether he ought to be suspended and disabled from holding any ecclesiastical preferment. The House decided on more than they were warranted, or had a right to do, and, therefore, this sentence, as well as the compulsory recantation, was most severe and unjust. And it was, probably, in this view that the King subsequently acted; for though he said nothing at the time, he doubtless judged Manwaring to have suffered innocently in his cause, and, accordingly, that grateful Prince not only remitted his chaplain's fine, but he afterwards promoted him to the living of Stamford

Rivers, in Essex, with a dispensation to hold St. Giles's in the Fields, (vacant by the promotion of the Commons' old enemy, Montague, to the see of Chichester,) then to the Deanery of Worcester, and some time after to the Bishopric of St. David's [1].

On the following day Laud's conduct was examined, and, after deliberation, "by God's goodness towards me," says he, "I was fully cleared." He was not, however, ignorant of the intentions of his enemies, for he declared that this Parliament sought his destruction, which was prevented by its sudden dissolution [2]. Nevertheless, though they failed to involve Laud in Manwaring's affairs, they had still another resource. In the remonstrance which they presented to the King against Buckingham, one part of it concerned religion, in which they alleged that "Dr. Neile, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells, are justly suspected to be unsound in their opinions in that way." They were, in short, voted to be favourers of Arminianism [3].

[1] Dr. Sibthorpe, the *other incendiary*, according to the charitable idea of the Puritan historian (vol. ii. p. 180.) was made prebendary of Peterborough, and rector of Burton Latimer, in Wiltshire.

[2] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 462.

[3] Diary, p. 42, 43. Heylin, p. 170, 171. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 621. Whitelock's Memorials, edit. 1732. p. 10. On this occasion, Laud has made the following entry. "The same day the House of Commons were making their remonstrance to the King. One head was innovation of religion. Therein they named my lord the Bishop of Winchester and myself. One in

It would, indeed, have been desirable, had the English House of Commons, when they thus exalted themselves into theological doctors, defined what they meant by Arminianism, or, at least, examined the principles and opinions of those whom they called Arminians, before they condemned them. Now, by their own admission, were there no other evidence, they did not; and what are we to think of the impeachments preferred against the royalists of that period, when their enemies, on their own shewing, either did not, or could not, tell why they had impeached them? It is easy to make an assertion; but assertions are not proofs: hence, if a man is alleged to be guilty, it must first be ascertained what he has done, to substantiate the charge. They admitted that Buckingham was impeached without a cause, that is, they had alleged none; and what should we have thought of Charles, if he had dismissed his minister to gratify the whim of a faction? That Buckingham was imprudent cannot be denied; still, his enemies knew well that he was not destitute of talents, and his imprudence is no warrant for them to calumniate him. If they made out no case against the Duke, he could not be guilty, because the law presumes a man innocent till it condemns him; and if there had been a cause, why not impeach for high crimes and misdemea-

the House stood up and said: now we have named these persons, let us think of some causes why we did it. Sir Edward Coke answered, Have we not named my lord of Buckingham without shewing a cause, and may we not be as bold with them?"

nours in the House, rather than remonstrate with the King? On the very same principle they proceeded with Laud and Neile; they charged them with something which they could not define, that is, they thought, as a matter of course, as they were about the business, that it would serve their purpose to insert the names of the two Bishops. And yet, when a member of the House stood up and said, that now, when they had named Laud and Neile, *they ought to think of the cause why they had been named,* he was silenced by Sir Edward Coke, who *sagaciously* observed, that "since my Lord of Buckingham had been impeached *without alleging any reason,* could not the same thing be done in the case of the two Bishops?" It is not difficult to form an opinion of the wisdom of those senators.

Convinced that this folly, to say the least, requires only to be named that it may be exposed, I here introduce a few observations respecting the Puritans and the Arminians. I have already stated that a profound ignorance existed among the former, whether wilful or casual I shall not inquire, on what they called Arminianism. This, indeed, was studiously cherished by the leading Calvinists, who, being all believers in Calvin's inspiration, imagined that it was necessary to carry their researches much farther than the "Institutions," and were well content to give implicit credit to all his notions. That daring and abstruse opinion which Calvin had published respecting Christ's

bodily descent into hell, and his suffering the pains of the damned in his soul, was firmly believed by his adherents: but several divines, at the head of whom was Laud, having attacked this, and other parts of the Genevan Bible, their opinions were not forgotten. In fact, the notion which Vorstius broached, that God had a body, and was subject to accidents and limitations, was hardly worse than this opinion of Calvin respecting Christ's descent into hell; and though King James overstepped the boundary of moderation, when he styled Vorstius "an arch-heretic, a pest, and monster of blasphemies[1]," yet it certainly deserved the severest reprehension. It is a feature of the Calvinists to believe all others in error; and it matters not whether it be in church-government or in doctrine; although, respecting the former, they received their share of opprobrium from their sectarian friends, the Independents, who not long after this alleged, that if Papists worshipped the beast, and Episcopalians the image of the beast, Presbyterians worshipped its shadow. Martin Bocanus went too far when he imprudently maintained, that the fruits of Calvinism are more pernicious than atheism; though Vitellius, a Calvinist, was not behind when he falsely asserted,

[1] Works of King James, p. 350. 352, 353. 356. It is worthy of remark, that James was actually incited to persecute Vorstius by Archbishop Abbot, whom the Puritans call a "mild and tolerant prelate."—Abridgement of Brand's Hist. of the Reformation of the Low Countries, 8vo. London, 1725, vol. ii. p. 318. Sir Ralph Winwood's Memorials, vol. iii. p. 296.

that the purpose of Arminianism was to introduce a subtle atheism into the Church. So dogmatic, however, was Calvin in his notions on election and other subtleties, that he undertook to reform the Lutherans, for which officiousness he was bitterly attacked by Giles Hunnius, a famous Lutheran divine, and Professor of Divinity at Marpurg, who charged him with Nestorianism, Judaism, Mahometanism, and Atheism. It is clear, however, that Calvin's opinions on polity were unknown in the Church before his day; and his notions concerning election and reprobation have a precedent only in the works of St. Augustine, who in some of his writings has advanced positions not dissimilar, though it must not be forgotten that the Father was then engaged in a hot dispute with the Manicheans, whom he violently opposed, for in other parts of his writings he expresses the unanimous belief of the Catholic Church.

Though I am perfectly justified in making a digression on this subject at present, because I am commenting on the life of a man whose only crime consisted in his being an Anti-Calvinist, that is, a believer in the old and scriptural doctrine of a full and free salvation to every individual of the human race who chooses to accept of it, in opposition to Calvin's notions of predestination and unconditional election, yet I shall refrain from entering minutely into a theological discussion, reserving that for another occasion. I stated that a deplorable ignorance existed on Arminianism, as they chose to call it, among all the Puritans, and more especially in the

House of Commons, among the members of which fanaticism was making rapid progress. Nor are there wanting specimens of this folly, which I shall adduce in another place, when I come to detail the future proceedings of the Parliament. But the conduct of the Parliament ought not to be passed over in silence. By crafty artifice they invariably coupled Arminianism with Popery; and though they must have known, before they delivered their opinions, that the former was just as irreconcilable to Popery as their own Calvinism, yet it furnished them with a convenient occasion to rail against the Church, and against Laud and others, its resolute defenders. Moreover, as the populace seldom reason, it was no difficult matter for those zealots to inflame their passions by misrepresentations of what they themselves did not understand, and secure partisans by their delusive speeches about liberty and the alleged tyranny of the court.

The Church of England, as I have before observed, is neither Calvinistic nor Arminian, so far as these are *human* systems; nor did that Church, in the persons of its venerable Reformers, first attach itself to the great name of any individual, and then endeavour to reconcile his opinions with the holy canon of Scripture. This was the case with certain other communions, but it was not so with the Church of England. Had it done so, what cause has it not for boasting, and where is the vantage ground of any other religious body? What illustrious names adorn the annals of the Church of

England! names which will bear a comparison with the most eminent Fathers of the primitive Church; men who were as much superior to Calvin, learned though he was, as he in turn was superior to his Scottish disciples. Where is there any church or sect, not even excepting the Church of Rome, which can rival the Church of England in the literary reputation of its sons? There is something, indeed, in its very constitution which encourages this noble emulation, and to this hour it sustains its celebrity. And those men were not "straitened in their bowels as to the extent of Christ's redemption." Great as they unquestionably were, they had too humble an opinion of themselves, as at best but unprofitable servants, to entertain a single harsh and limited thought of the love of God. If, as the Puritans pretended, the Articles of the Church, especially the Seventeenth, are Calvinistic, why did they evince such factious restlessness to make them appear so? The confession of no Church has given rise to so many disputes as that of the Church of England; its Articles have been wrested from their literal and grammatical sense, to support the opinions of a party. Now, who thinks of asserting that the Scottish Confession of Faith is Arminian? Who ever alleged, that the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, received by the Presbyterian Church, and originally put forth by the Westminster Calvinistic Assembly, are not Calvinistic? The attempt has never been made, because the melancholy doctrine is there elicited in terms too plain, (I say melancholy, indeed,

if true), that "God hath from eternity elected some to everlasting life," and doomed others to everlasting death, not from any good or bad works of theirs, but merely "*for the praise of his glorious grace*." Is this a reason agreeable to our notions as rational beings of God and his heavenly revelation? and yet religion, or rather Christianity, is addressed to man's reason, not to his imagination or his senses; it is not a mere speculative or visionary subject, but it must be reduced to practice, and practice is just the effect of which the exercise of our faculties is the cause. Religion without works is a contradiction in terms; its very existence is impossible. Is a man doomed to everlasting damnation before he is born, nay, from all eternity? And is such a man born in a Christian country, and called on to repent as a miserable sinner? How can he accept the call, since he is restrained by a religious necessity? Is he able to contend with God, or is God a man, that he should change his eternal decree? Or, if Calvinism be true, is it not a mere mockery of a rational being and the possessor of an immortal soul (I speak it with awe) to pass a decree that he cannot be saved, yet to call him to repentance, and to condemn him for what he could not help? What can man do? The decree of God must take effect, and, therefore, he must take his chance of being either elected or reprobated. But how different is the real state of the case? Where would be the efficacy of the holy sacrament of Baptism, that sign and seal of regeneration, a new life,

and an engrafting into Christ's body, without which sacrament I will not, indeed, say no human being can be saved, whether infant or adult; but by which holy sacrament all baptized infants are saved, and all adults who fulfil, in the years of reason, their baptismal vows? or are we to entertain that most degrading thought, that this holy sacrament is nothing more than a mere rite, a formal ceremony? The thought, I confess, appears to me to border on profaneness. And then, when we come to the Scriptures, how discordant are they with the limitations of Calvinism! There we are indeed told the important truth, that believers may finally fall; there we are told in every page, that Christ, as the venerable Latimer expresses it, shed as much blood for Judas as he did for St. Paul; there we have revelations of the boundless mercy of God; there we are commanded to address God as our Father; there, in short, we are commanded to believe and obey the gospel, being assured that they who come unto God will not come in vain.

In these observations I have not adduced arguments from the Holy Scriptures, because the subject has been often discussed, and because I wish to avoid a theological disputation, making my remarks to bear principally on the system, and the conduct of the Puritans, in violently condemning Bishops Laud and Neile. Now, it is well known, that Calvinism was never imagined to be the religion of England before the return of those exiles whom the Marian persecution had forced from their country;

and it is a singular fact, that almost all those who afterwards held situations in the Church, and introduced the Calvinistic doctrines, were those who had resided during that persecution at Geneva, and returned with a warm admiration of Calvin's system. But had the Articles been Calvinistic, why make vigorous attempts to make them appear so, since they speak for themselves? and yet I need not remind the reader of the Lambeth Articles, of Cartwright's turbulence, and of the insidious mal-practices of the Puritan faction in the Universities, during the latter years of Elizabeth, and the whole of James' reign, as the Puritans themselves evinced at the Hampton Court Conference. These discussions, indeed, I must at present avoid. The Church of England, I again maintain, rejects the system of Arminius as a *human system;* it rests on the holy canon of inspiration, it appeals to the Law and the Gospel, and its Articles and Homilies were established before any thing was known either of Calvin or Arminius[1]. But, since it is clear that Calvinism is not the doctrine of the Church, since it is evident and undeniable, that the venerable fathers of the Church were guided solely by the Scriptures and primitive antiquity, if the opinions of Arminius and the Dutch Remonstrants coincide with the Articles, the Church rather rejoices that a communion should be found in unison with itself, which

[1] Articles of the Church, and Eccles. Canons, Can. xxxvi. and Stat. 13 Eliz. c. xii. § 1 and 3.

holds apostolical truth: but the Church cannot be called Arminian, otherwise it was so before Arminius was known; and if such be the case, the Scriptures are Arminian, so were the holy Apostles, the Fathers, and the primitive Church [1].

James Van Harmen, or Arminius, was as far removed from Popery as Calvin, Gomarus, or any other of his violent opposers. So also were the illustrious Limborch, Episcopius, Grotius, and others, as well as those immortal men of the Church of England in the seventeenth century, who had the courage to employ their reasoning faculties respecting predestination and grace. But the true cause why the Puritans condemned Arminianism, (for I shall still call it so, because language is arbitrary,) was, that Laud and his friends were unpopular, on account of their connexion with the court. Whoever adhered to the unfortunate Charles was certain of condemnation. The coupling of Arminianism and Popery was the common cant and knavery of the times. Popery, Arminianism, Atheism, Heresy, were all classed together, as well by the English Puritans as by the Scottish Covenanters, the latter of whom entered into their impious League and Covenant, which they called Solemn, to put to the sword all those who differed from themselves. It need not be again stated, that Arminianism and Popery have as little connexion

[1] Laurence's (Archbishop) Bampton Lectures, Lect. I. Heylin, Quinquart. Controv. p. 624.

as the latter has with Calvinism: and if in some things the Arminians agreed with the Papists, does that unite them in a common cause? But it is too true, that among zealots every thing is bad and damnable which agrees not with their notions. The man who does not fall in with the extravagancies of the day is denounced as irreligious; if he does not adopt the peculiar phraseology of *pietism*, he need not expect to escape persecution; and men who, stimulated by that dangerous enthusiasm which must ever retard the progress of pure and rational religion, set all reason and authority at defiance, have invariably made it their custom to calumniate their opponents. What right, as it has been well demanded, had Calvin and his followers to give laws to the whole Christian Church? Did the Puritans conceive that they were the only conscientious persons in the nation? or rather, ought not those religionists to have known that other opinions had as good a right to allowance and toleration? But such was not their system. They thought it perfectly right to be intolerant to others; but, if there was the slightest severity towards themselves, they commenced their clamour about liberty, tyranny, Popery, Arminianism, and Atheism.

I am not, let it be observed, defending Arminianism as a system, but am stating what seems to me to be undeniable truth. Laud has been condemned as the violent defender of Arminianism; the charge has been again and again repeated, and there needs no other proof of his infamy, his "*infamous*

memory," with some sectarian writers, than this assumed fact; and in his patronage of Arminianism they have easily accounted for his alleged persecution of the Puritans. Now, I will admit that Laud held the opinions of the Dutch Remonstrants, which admission will make evident the absurdity of the Puritan inference. For it is a notorious fact, that of all sects the Calvinists, when in power, were the most intolerant; as the conduct of their leader at Geneva, and of his adherents in England and Scotland, abundantly proves; to such a degree, indeed, that England felt the yoke of Calvinism intolerable; and, had it been established finally in Scotland, according to the fanatical notions of the Covenanting zealots, it would have been equally unsufferable. In the latter country, at and before this period, the same spirit pervaded the heart of every Presbyterian preacher, which had doomed the mild and virtuous, though mistaken, Servetus to the stake; which had secured the banishment of Bolsée, which had endeavoured to take the life and ruin the character of the wise and learned Castellio, and which had induced Calvin, the grand author of these atrocities, to write a cool and deliberate defence of them, especially of the murder of Servetus, in the French and Latin languages. "Popery fell for ever," says an author [1], remarking on the effects of Calvinism, "but its ministers were succeeded by a

[1] Cursory Remarks, prefixed to Scottish Poems of the 16th Century, by J. G. Dalyell, Esq. vol. i. p. 43, 44. Edinburgh, 12mo. 1801.

class of men not more liberal or more tolerant. Proud and imperious, no opportunity of displaying their authority was spared, and that in the most grating manner. Very soon after their establishment they condemned the Countess of Argyle to humiliations in the Church of Stirling, for assisting at the baptism of King James, and the High Treasurer of Scotland to public penance in the Church of Edinburgh. To be placid and humble formed no part of their constitution. All were deep politicians. If one preached sedition, he quoted authorities in Scripture: if he intermeddled in the privacy of families, he maintained his privilege of checking vice. Causes too trifling for repetition, they debated as earnestly as matters of the highest importance. Punishment, and the mode of inflicting it, occupied more attention than the manner of repressing crime. Imaginary Puritans, they thought by a decree to effect that refined improvement which can only be accomplished by the slow and imperceptible hand of time. Mercy and compassion for those whom they had supplanted were banished. If their hands were not imbrued with blood, it was from inability, not the want of desire. Such were the authors, and such the rudiments of a system which sense, caution, and moderation, have now rendered it UNSAFE TO IMPROVE."

These sentiments equally apply to the Puritans of England as to those of Scotland, and they gave ample demonstration, before a century elapsed after the Reformation, that they were not slow to im-

brue their hands in blood, thus completing their long-devised schemes of treason and rebellion. But as to Arminianism, the Remonstrants, as the Dutch followers of Arminius were called, and whose opinions Laud is condemned for maintaining, were actually those who were the real patriots to their country, whereas the Calvinists ruled it with no gentle hand. For the famous Synod of Dort, which, under the pretence of a fair discussion, (every member of it being compelled to take an oath to that effect [1],) was called by the professed enemies of the Remonstrants for the very purpose of condemning them, arrived at more absurd and intolerant conclusions than any Popish council. It was composed of their professed enemies, and the oath was no guarantee; for the Calvinists had previously resolved how to act, and had determined to condemn every thing as false and heretical which agreed not with their preconceived opinions. Few persons need be told, that Arminianism is more favourable to liberty than Calvinism, because the very nature of the latter is against any spirit of free enquiry, and makes man beyond dispute a religious necessitarian; and hence, if Laud patronised Arminianism merely from love to Arminius, it will be difficult to reconcile his opinions with his pretended practice. Nor can the proceedings of that Synod, which James unhappily countenanced, afford the least argument against Laud's conduct.

[1] Abridgement of Brandt, vol. ii. p. 417. 511.

It has indeed established its reputation among the prejudiced and the vulgar; its members had an opportunity of gratifying their ambition, and they endeavoured to avenge themselves on those who had excelled them in celebrity: but, instead of tending to promote unity and concord, it was a firebrand in the Church, the Remonstrants were condemned, and the Synod readily assisted in those calamities which they afterwards experienced [1].

The answer of the King to this Remonstrance against Bishops Laud and Neile, declared that great wrong was done to two great prelates without any proof. "For should they or any others," said the King, "attempt innovation of religion, we shall quickly take order with them, without staying for the remonstrance." And the assertion, that Arminianism was a cunning way to introduce Popery, was met by the King with this decisive answer, that "it was a mere dream," and that attention to it "would make our people believe we were asleep."

The Puritan historian, however, thinks otherwise; and as proof he has inserted from Rushworth's Collections an abstract of a letter alleged to have been written by a Jesuit in England to the Rector of their College at Brussels [2], which, says that sectarian writer, in his usual manner, "will suffi-

[1] Hale's Golden Remains, p. 454. London edit. 8vo. 1687.

[2] Vol. i. p. 414. Neal, vol. ii. p. 182, 183, 184. and he refers to the effusion entitled "Foxes and Firebrands."

ciently support the Parliament's charge, and shew how Arminianism and Popery, *which have no natural connexion*[1], came to be united at this time *against the Protestant* religion and the liberties of England[2]."

I shall not stop here to enquire whether this letter be genuine or not, but shall assume it as such, and by that means meet Neal's arguments. This letter states, after glancing at the political connexions of James with Spain, "that none but the Puritan faction, *which plotted nothing but anarchy,* and James' confusion, were averse to the Spanish treaty;" that the Papists "have made great use of this anarchical election [referring to the assembled parliament] and have prejudicated and anticipated the great one, that none but the King's enemies, and his, are chosen of this Parliament." "When King James lived," says the writer, "he was very violent against Arminianism, and interrupted with his pestilent art, and deep learning, our strong designs in Holland, and was a great friend to that old rebel and heretic, the Prince of Orange. Now, we have planted that sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy, and it bears fruit in due season. Our foundation is Arminianism: the Arminians and pro-

[1] This is a remarkable admission, and yet he contradicts himself, as usual, in the next sentence.

[2] Neal, ut sup.

jectors, as it appears on the premises, affect imitation[1]."

This is a mere extract from the said letter, which Neal has garbled in his history; but it is worthy of a few remarks. In the first instance, that writer presumes to say, "It appears, from this letter, that Puritanism was the only bulwark of the Constitution, and of the Protestant religion, against the inroads of Popery and arbitrary power." But it certainly does *not* appear so, even from Neal's version of it; and what will the reader say, when he is told, that this very letter talks of the Puritans with the utmost contempt, says that "they plotted nothing but anarchy and confusion," and actually bears witness that the Jesuits were following the Puritan practices. "I cannot but laugh," says the writer, "to see how some of our coat have accoutred themselves. You would scarce know them if you saw them. *And it is admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans*[2]." Yet those passages are all suppressed by this sectarian, as will be seen by a comparison between his version of the letter and the complete one in Rushworth; and, though conscious of this chicanery, he has the assurance to tell his reader that "it appears from

[1] Rushworth, ut sup.

[2] That is, snuffle, cant, and whine, like the mad fanatics at conventicles, who would frequently (as they do yet) hear two or more sermons a-day, and repeat the same again, and afterwards pray, and fast all day long.

this letter that Puritanism was the *only bulwark* of the Constitution!"

Let it be again noted, that as the Jesuits, above all the other Orders of the Romish Church, agreed with the Arminians respecting the theological doctrine of free grace, it was not, surely, to be supposed that they would treat it with contempt. But, on the other hand, the Dominicans and the vapouring Jansenists were as rigid Predestinarians as Calvin himself. Arminianism is indeed called a "sovereign drug," but it was so only to the "Puritan faction, which plotted nothing but anarchy," and it mattered not though the Jesuit declared that "his foundation was Arminianism," (as it in reality was, in reference to the acknowledged doctrines of the Order,) since by his own testimony he acted with the Puritans "both in speech and gesture." Now, even granting Neal's view of the case, is it not evident that a Jansenist would have written very differently; and how absurd is it to produce, as a decisive authority, the individual letter of an unknown Jesuit, (always *presuming* that it is genuine,) when every one knows that the Romish orders entertained a more bitter rivalry and jealousy towards each other, than perhaps towards the Protestants;—that they were in open hostility, as is proved by the proceedings of the Calvinistic Dominicans against the Franciscans,—and that, in all probability, we should have heard of none of the tricks of monks at all, had they not fallen out among themselves, and exposed the knavery

of the whole by their endeavours to spoil each other's trade.

It is a well-known fact, that the Romanists treated the Puritans with sovereign contempt, fomented the discords among them, knowing well that they were utterly unable to combat the follies of Rome. The Puritan extravagances were not only encouraged, but adopted, by the Romish missionaries, that they might weaken and ultimately overthrow the Church. But as an antidote to the Puritan historian's view of the matter, as well as to refute the opinions of all those who agree with him, the following extract from a letter, written to Laud at a later period, and by a more unexceptionable person than this pretended Jesuit, will exhibit the matter in a different light. "Be you assured," says Sir William Boswell, the English resident at the Hague, "the Romish clergy have gulled (deceived) the misled party of our English nation, and that under a Puritanical dress: for which the several fraternities of that Church have lately received indulgence from the See of Rome and Council of Cardinals, to educate some of the young fry of the Church of Rome, who be natives of his Majesty's realms and dominions, and instruct them in all manner of principles and tenets contrary to the Episcopacy of the Church of England. There be in the town of the Hague, to my certain knowledge, two dangerous impostors, who have large indulgences granted to them, and known to be of the Church of Rome, although they seem to be Puri-

tans. The main drift of their intention is to pull down the English Episcopacy; for which purpose, above sixty Romish clergymen are gone within these two years out of the monasteries of the French King's dominions, to preach up the Scot's Covenant, and Mr. Knox's prescriptions and rules within that Kirk, and to spread the same about the northern coasts of England. There be great preparations making already against the Liturgy and Ceremonies of the Church of England, and all evil contrivances here and in France, and in the other Protestant holdings, to make your Grace and the Episcopacy odious to the *Reformed Protestants* abroad. It has wrought so much on divers of the foreign ministers of the Protestants, that they esteem our clergy little better than Popish. The main things that they hit in our teeth are, our bishops to be called lords, the service of the Church, the cross in baptism, confirmation, bowing at the name of Jesus, the communion-table placed altar-ways, our manner of consecrations[1]."

The same facts are farther corroborated at a subsequent period by Bishop Bramhall in 1646, who, when in exile from his See of Derry, in Ireland, informed Archbishop Usher, that by an order from Rome, above an hundred of the Popish clergy were sent into England, consisting of English, Scots, and Irish, who had been educated in the Popish conti-

[1] Sir W. Boswell to Archbishop Laud, dated the Hague, 10th of June, 1640, Cotton Papers, Cal. and also Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. No. XI. p. 334.

nental kingdoms, and who were prepared to assume any disguise which would tend to the overthrow of the Church of England, by pretending to advocate *Presbytery, Independency, Anabaptism, Atheism,* or any thing, in short, which would be advanced by the sectarians. The same prelate also substantiates the fact, that it was universally understood by these incendiaries, "that *there was no better design to confound the Church of England, than by pretending liberty of conscience;*" and "*that it was lawful for Roman Catholics to work changes in governments* (this is actually the policy of the doctors of the Sorbonne) *for mother church's advancement, and chiefly in an heretical kingdom, and so lawfully may make away with the king.*"

Now, let the reader bear in mind the conduct of the Puritan faction in Parliament; let him calmly, and without prejudice, weigh this evidence with the representations of the Puritan historian, and then he will see how far that writer's assertion is true, "that *Puritanism* was the *only bulwark* of the constitution, and of *the Protestant religion,* against the *inroads of Popery and arbitrary power.*" The very reverse was the case. The follies and absurdities of those affected religionists were the grand medium by which the Papists intended to overthrow the Church of this "heretical kingdom;" and we see that they actually had instructions and dispensations to imitate "the speech and gesture of the Puritans," towards whom they cherished not hatred, truly, for they reckoned them altogether un-

worthy antagonists, but a profound contempt. And what are we to think of a faction, which divided in itself, into Presbyterians, Brownists or Independents, Anabaptists, &c. could by its extravagances entice the Papists to unite with it; men who held, *and who do still hold,* that it was lawful for Roman Catholics to work changes in governments for mother church's advancement, and chiefly in an heretical kingdom; but, above all, that *it was lawful to make away with the king?* Where, then, is this Puritanism, this boasted bulwark of English liberty, this preservative of the Protestant religion? If the secret intentions of both Papists and Puritans to destroy the King be liberty, it is indeed a species of it heretofore unknown. If the cant of the times against Popery and Arminianism be an indication of liberty, I maintain that there was a despotism concealed under those remonstrances more intolerable than that of the Roman Emperors. And the reign of hypocrisy and fanaticism, which was hastening on, and which Laud and his great coadjutors strove to avert, but strove in vain, is proof of these remarks. "Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits," says a learned writer, one of the present distinguished ornaments of the Scottish Episcopal Church, "could then unite and symbolize with Covenanters, Independents, Anabaptists, and Atheists; and perhaps their leaders, and many of their agents and abettors, had universally the same motive, the promotion of their own temporal influence, honour, and interest, and the gratification of those peculiar passions and pre-

judices, which they cherished. Religion and liberty were equally the pretext of all; both excellent and worthy, the former of all reverence, and the latter of all respect; but each utterly incompatible with those vices, with that turbulence, with that malignity, with that hypocrisy, aye, and with that intolerance, of which those pretenders, Papists and Puritans, Monks and Covenanters, were almost universally and habitually guilty[1]."

On the 26th of June the Parliament was prorogued till the 20th of October, and the proceedings against Buckingham in the mean time ceased. The favourites of Princes are generally unpopular with the rabble, who, envying a grandeur which is not their birth-right, and which they have not the capacity to attain, display their jealousy and hatred by dastardly intrigues and by resolute opposition. Yet no monarch is so utterly blind as to bestow his favours on men who cannot appreciate them, or who cannot render him suitable services in return: at all events, the rabble are not those who are to judge their Sovereign, not even in an age famed for the "*march of intellect.*" The promotion of minions without capacity is indeed to be deprecated; but certainly a Prince has a right to bestow his favour at will. It is the elevation of plebeian ignorance and pride, without talents for affairs, which ought to be scrutinized; and the nobles of the land will not be

[1] Scottish Episcopal Magazine, ut sup. In the admirable sketch of the Life of Archbishop Laud.

forgetful of their birth-right. But want of illustrious descent is no disgrace to the man who is worthy of high promotion; the nobility of his mind in some degree compensates for his obscure origin.

On the 11th of July, Laud's *congé d'élire* was signed by the King; and on the 15th of that month, 1629, being St. Swithin's day, he was translated from Bath and Wells to London. He had been nominated on the 17th of June, 1628; but from the causes already mentioned, he was restrained from the possession of his new diocese till this year. He was succeeded in Bath and Wells by Dr. Leonard Mawe[1].

Thus have we seen this great prelate already filling two dioceses with distinguished reputation, fearless in the discharge of his duty, disdaining to become a time-server, firm in his fidelity to his Sovereign, and devoted to the Church of which he was the ornament. In the midst of opposition, intrigue, faction, and foul reproach, he was undaunted, and his animating virtue rose superior to the extravagances of religious enthusiasm: we observe him pursuing his course with uniform consistency, resolved to establish the Protestant Church of England on a secure foundation, or to perish in his noble undertaking. Who, then, will deny him the praise of being a man truly great, if integrity, probity, religion, profound learning, modesty, are

[1] Le Neve's Fasti Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ, p. 34.

worthy of praise[1]? Of course, he will be condemned for his bigotry, but, to say the least, he was as tolerant as any of his contemporaries. Nor let it be said, as has been often done by sectarian writers, that Laud in any way frustrated the fair prospects of the seventeenth century. "Human society," says the learned writer just quoted, (and the following language cannot be too attentively weighed by the affected liberalists of the present day,) "is not a fit field for the rash experiments of any set of men, whatever character they assume, and whatever pretensions they exhibit: whether they wear the garb of religious fanaticism, or whether, under the mask of hypocrisy, they lean to superstition and sectarianism, or whether, rejecting religion altogether, they wear the mask of mild philosophy. The mask is different, and the mode is various. The motives are generally the same. Even when the intentions are sound and sincere, the execution is doubtful. We cannot, in any society, great or small, calculate the consequences of essential change with absolute certainty; and, therefore, he who seriously, and of set purpose, undermines the established principles by which any society is held together, whether his pretext be religion or liberty, a reformed system of faith, or a philosophical improvement of policy and manners, is justly to be suspected of views beyond what he avows, and may be

[1] "Vir vere magnus, si quid habent probitas, pietas, fides, summa eruditio, par modestia, mores sanctissimi."

justly resisted, even when he is sincere; because he cannot with any certainty say, even if he obtain his avowed object, 'Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed.' He cannot even assure us, as experience universally proves, that when his avowed object is attained, he will be satisfied himself. The reformer, whether religious, political, or philosophical, who addresses reason to the public reason of mankind is always respectable, and will generally produce a salutary though a gradual influence on the public mind. But he who addresses the mob, and who labours to enlist the populace in his service, aims evidently at revolution; and if salutary consequences ultimately result, it will generally be through scenes of crime and suffering, and by a Providence over which the original agitator has no control. There is a limitation of intellect and of vision in such men, with all their high pretensions, which is truly pitiable. With pretensions which have no limit, they seem chained to earth and fixed to time, as if society were a mass of matter on which they may repeat experiments *ad infinitum*, without regarding the misery which they occasion, or the risk to which they expose the individuals whom they influence, when time with them shall give place to eternity."

CHAPTER X.

1628—1629.

Insinuations against Laud—His conduct—Preparations for the war with France—The Duke of Buckingham assumes the command—He proceeds to Portsmouth—Is there assassinated—Account of the murder—Public expressions of detestation—Character of Buckingham—Laud's conduct—Consecration of Dr. Montague—The exceptions against it over-ruled—Examination of Felton, the Duke's murderer—His trial and execution—the University of Oxford—Laud's care and munificence—His patronage of learning—The King's Declaration—Its nature and tendency—Remarks on it—The King's inclination to a reconciliation—Advancement of Sir Thomas Wentworth—The Third Parliament—Notice of the Speeches in it—Censure of the King's Declaration—Intolerance of the Puritanical party—Proceedings of Laud—Theological disputes—Conduct of the Parliament—Disorders in the Commons—Their contempt of the royal authority—Uproar at their adjournment—Dissolution of the Third Parliament—Libels against Laud.

It will be readily supposed, that Laud's enemies did not behold his advancement to the see of London with unconcern. The favour of the King, and the vigorous discharge of his duty, were reasons sufficient, in the eyes of the Puritans, to make him the object of their hatred; and they dreaded the effects of his vigilance in the administration of the

important diocese over which he was called to preside. The metropolis being the grand resort of their leaders, they felt that the security they had enjoyed under Montaigne was at an end. Archbishop Abbot was now aged and infirm, otherwise he might have renewed his opposition; but as he lived in retirement, his house resembled more a conventicle than the residence of a Protestant Bishop. Nevertheless, those whom he patronised were not idle: they practised with the parliamentary zealots, and it was industriously circulated that Laud wrote all the King's and Buckingham's speeches. This report excited the indignation of the rabble, who gave the utmost credence to the insinuations of their leaders. But Laud endured these calumnies with his accustomed fortitude, conscious of his own integrity, and of the singleness of his motives.

About this period we find the Bishop named one of a commission of a very disagreeable nature, namely, one for raising money, by impositions, taxes, or otherwise, which the Commons called Excises. This commission is directed to twenty-three lords and others of the council, but it does not appear to have been executed [1].

After the prorogation of Parliament, Buckingham, in the interval, endeavoured to regain that popularity which he had lately lost by the charges made against him in the House of Commons. For this purpose, he resolved to make a second expedi-

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 614, 615, 616.

tion to Rochelle, which was then closely besieged by the French, by which he might accede to the wishes of the inhabitants, who had requested, by their deputies, that he would again take the command in person[1]. On the 12th of August, 1628, he left London for Portsmouth, to put himself at the head of the expedition, and to superintend the preparations.

This journey proved fatal to him, nor was he destined ever again to return to the court of his sovereign. It is not my intention to narrate the famous story of the apparition which he is alleged to have seen before his departure, to warn him of his death, which, notwithstanding the discussion it has occasioned, and the credulity of Lord Clarendon, is a mere idle tale. Yet the Duke, before his departure, seems to have had some melancholy prepossessions, originating, probably, from his knowledge of the popular discontent. In parting with Laud, his friend and confident, he said that he was well aware of the King's unalterable affection towards him, and he therefore besought his Lordship to recommend his poor wife and children to his Majesty's notice. Laud, alarmed at the Duke's manner and language, asked him, if he had never any forebodings, to which the Duke replied, "No, but I think I may chance to be killed as well as any other man[2]."

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 467.

[2] Sir Henry Wotton's Life of the Duke of Buckingham, edit. 1642.

John Felton was an obscure person, but of a good family, in the county of Suffolk. He had served under Sir John Ramsay, but having been refused the command of a company by the Duke, when his captain was killed at the Isle of Rhé, he resigned his commission, and retired from the army at the time that the faction in the House of Commons declared Buckingham to be "the principal cause of all the evils the kingdom suffered [1]." This remonstrance, and a fanatical libel written against the unfortunate nobleman, instigated this gloomy enthusiast to contrive his assassination. He accordingly loitered about Portsmouth, and, for the purpose of securing an opportunity, watched narrowly the Duke's proceedings, who lodged in the house of one Captain Mason. On this morning, he mingled with the crowd attending in the room where Buckingham was dressing, and preparing for breakfast. The public discourse was on the relief of Rochelle, and several French officers were urging him to a speedy departure. A domestic having announced that breakfast was ready, the Duke prepared to leave the room, when, turning to address Sir Thomas Fryar, one of his colonels, he was struck over that officer's shoulder by the assassin, and pierced to the heart. The unfortunate nobleman exclaimed, "The villain has killed me;" and pulling out the

[1] History of England by Laurence Echard, M.A. Archdeacon of Stowe, folio, London, 1788, vol. i. p. 68. Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, p. 523.

knife with his own hand, he sunk on the floor, and soon after expired, on Saturday, the 23d day of August, 1628, in the 36th year of his age [1].

[1] The following letter, which gives a very minute account of this unfortunate nobleman's assassination, will not be deemed uninteresting. It was written by Lord Carleton to the Queen, dated Southwick, on Saturday, "at afternoon, August 23d, 1628, touching the tragicall end of my Lord Duke of Buckingham." (Lansdowne MSS. Miscellan. Collect. 213.)

"Maddam, I am to trouble your Grace with a most lamentable relation. This day, betwixt nine and ten of the clocke in the morning, the Duke of Buckingham, then comming out of a parlor into a hall, to goe to his coach, and ride to the King, (who was four miles off,) having about him diverse lords, collonells, and captaines, and many of his owne servants, was by one Felton (once a lieutenant of his own army) slaine at one blow with a dagger knife. In his staggering he turned about, uttering only this word *villaine*, and never spake word more, but presently plucking out the knife from himselfe, before he fell to the ground, hee made towards the traytor two or three paces, and then fell against a table, altho' he were upheld by diverse that were neere him, that, through the villain's close carriage in the act could not perceive him hurt at all, but guessed him to be suddenly oversway'd with some apoplexie, till they saw the blood come gushing from his mouth and the wound soe fast, that life and breath at once left his begored body.

"Maddam, you may easily guesse what outcryes were then made by us that were commaunders and officers there present, when wee saw him thus dead in a moment, and slaine by an unknowne hand, for it seems that the Duke himselfe only knew who it was that had murdered him, and by meanes of the confined presse at the instant about his person, wee neither did nor could. The souldiers feare his losse will be their utter ruine, wherefore att that instant the house, and the court about it were full, every man present with the Duke's body, endea-

In the midst of the great and general consternation, the assassin was for some moments unnoticed.

vouring a care of itt. In the meane time Felton pass'd the throng, which was confusedly great, not soe much as mark'd or followed, insoemuch that not knowing where, nor who he was that had done the fact, some came to keepe guard at the gates, and others went to the ramparts of the towne: in all which time the villaine was standing in the kitchen of the same house, and after the inquiry made by a multitude of captaines and gentlemen, then pressing into the same house and court, and crying out amaine, "Where is the villain? where is the butcher?" he most audaciously, and resolutely drawing forth his sword, came out, and went amongst them, saying boldly, "I am the man, heere I am," upon which diverse drew upon him, with an intent to have then dispatched him, but Sir Thomas Morton, my selfe, and some others, used such meanes, (tho' with much trouble and difficulty) that wee drew him out of their hands, and by order of my Lord High Chamberlaine, wee had the charge of keeping him from any coming to him, until a guard of musketeers were brought to convey him to the governor's house, when we were discharged.

"My Lord High Chamberlane and Mr. Secretary Cooke who were then at the governor's house, did there take his examination, of which as yet there is nothing knowne, only whilst he was in our custody I asked him several questions, to which he answered, viz. Hee sayed, he was a Protestant in religion; hee also expressed himself, that hee was partly discontented for want of government pay, which was due unto him, and for that he being lieutenant of a company of foot, the company was given over his head unto another, and yet hee sayd, that that did not move him to this resolution, but that hee reading *the remonstrance of the House of Parliament*, it came into his mind, that in committing the act of killing the Duke, he should doe his country great and good service. And hee sayd, that tomorrow *he was to be prayed for in London*. I then asked him, att what church, and to what

But at length, on the Duke's attendants turning to discover the murderer, a hat was found, with a writing concealed in it, containing some remarks on the remonstrance of the Commons, a few ejaculatory expressions in the form of a prayer, and the reasons which moved him to commit the act[1].

purpose; hee told me at a church by Fleet Street conduit, and as for a man much discontented in mind. Now, wee seeing things to fall from him in this manner, suffered him not to bee further questioned by any, thinking it much fitter for the Lords to examine him, and to find it out, and know from him, whether hee was encouraged, and sett on by any to performe this wicked deed.

"But to returne to the screeches made att the fatall blow given, the Duchesse of Buckingham and the Countess of Anglesey came forth into a gallery, which looked into the hall, where they might behold the blood of their deerest lord gushing from him. Ah! poor ladies! such were their screeching, teares, and distractions, that I never in my life heard the like before, and hope never to heare the like againe. His Majesties griefe for the losse of him was expressed to bee more than great, by the many teares hee hath shed for him, with which I will conclude this sad and untimely news.

* * * * * * * * *

"Maddam, this is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, yet all too much too, if it had soe pleased God. I thought it my bounden duty, howsoever, to let your Majestie have the first intelligence of it, by the hand of, Maddam, your sorrowful servant, DUDLEY CARLETON."

[1] Felton probably thought he would be immediately put to death, and therefore he had prepared this writing. His reasons were, 1. "That man is cowardly, and deserveth neither the name of a gentleman or a soldier, in my opinion, that will not sacrifice his life for the good of his country." This is evidently a com-

Some persons immediately demanded, who was the murderer? when Felton, instead of making the least attempt to escape, which he could easily have effected, calmly stepped forward, and confessed the fact [1]. Being in danger of immediate death from the rage of the attendants, he was secured. As if to induce him to make a discovery of the motives to commit the crime, one of the Duke's friends said, that the Duke was only much wounded, but not without hopes of recovery: but Felton replied with a smile, that he knew well he had struck a mortal blow. When further questioned as to his motives, or who had incited him, he firmly replied, "That all their inquiries were of little avail; no man had interest enough with him to dispose him to such an action; it proceeded merely from the impulse of his own conscience, and he had placed a writing in his hat in explanation, because he thought he might probably perish in the attempt [2]."

ment on the Remonstrance of the Commons. 2. "*If I bee slaine*, let no man discommend me for what I have done, but rather discommend himself who is the cause of it. It is for our sins that our hearts are hardened, and become senseless, else he (the Duke) had not gone soe long unpunished. J. Felton."—Harleian MSS. 1327. Lansdowne MSS. 213.

[1] It is alleged, that "a man was seen walking very composedly before the door without a hat; and upon one crying out, here is the man that killed the Duke, and others demanding, which is he, he calmly answered, I am he." Echard, ut sup.

[2] It is to be remarked, that had Felton not confessed, there was no evidence to condemn him, and he might have made his escape unobserved. No one had seen him commit the crime.

Charles was at Southwick, four miles distant, with his court, when the Duke met his fate. When intelligence of the murder was communicated to him, he was at divine service, and Sir Thomas Hippesley whispered it to him while he was at his devotions. But that excellent Prince knew too well the nature of the duties in which he was engaged, to express himself at the moment, and restraining his feelings, he continued during prayers unmoved. But no sooner was the service ended, than retiring to his apartment, he threw himself on his couch, and wept at the unhappy fate of his minister. In this disconsolate condition he continued several days. These facts refute the assertions which have been made, that Charles secretly rejoiced at Buckingham's death, as setting him free from a nobleman who was a restraint to him, and unpopular with his subjects. It ought to be remembered, that the seeming apathy which the King manifested was a victory over his natural disposition, and that it was solely a real regard for religion which induced him to avoid an interruption of the sacred duties in which he was engaged. And from the attachment which the King displayed towards the family and friends of his unfortunate minister, from the scrupulous exactness with which he discharged the Duke's numerous debts, contracted, indeed,

Strong religious phrensy, a curiosity to know whether his revenge had been gratified, or a perturbed mind, probably induced him to loiter about the door.

for his service, though there was no direct evidence of the fact, it may be easily conceived how far the memory of this great man was esteemed by his grateful master.

Thus fell, by the hand of an assassin, the Duke of Buckingham, prime minister to Charles I. and the favourite of two monarchs. Had this great man lived in a more auspicious age, his name might have been recorded by historians with no inconsiderable praise, but, unfortunately, he was calumniated by a faction, who hated the King and those whom he favoured. He did not want a sure friend in Laud, but the opposition of the Puritan zealots made him unguarded and passionate; and while he frequently consulted that prelate, he had not sufficient firmness to act according to his counsels. With the people he had become casually popular by promoting the war with Spain and France; but the Puritans, who swayed the mob, and who pretended at first the utmost eagerness for that war, turned against him, as they did against Charles, and blamed him for much which they themselves might have averted. The promoting of those two wars occasioned his ruin, nor did his enemies cease to pursue him till the moment he was deprived of his life. And their hatred towards this great man arose from the evil spirit of the times, the venom of which increased from day to day, till at length the faction corrupted the nation, and made it disgusted with the royal government, which undeniably was

administered with greater mildness than in any former reign. His generosity was great, his munificence worthy of a noble disposition, amounting in many cases to prodigality: he was sincere in his friendships and attachments, implacable in his enmities, yet in the latter he behaved with those principles of honour which he had adopted, inasmuch as he disdained the littleness of intriguing hostility, but rather made no secret of his hatred, candidly informing those who had fallen under his displeasure that he was their enemy. His personal courage was also undoubted, and Sir Henry Wotton assures us, that in the Duke's unfortunate expedition to Rhé, which he undertook solely to recover his popularity, his conduct has been less censured by the French writers than by our own. "His carriage," says that writer, "was noble throughout; respectful to the gentlemen, bountiful to the soldiers, as he found any distinguished worth in them; tender and careful of the wounded; his personal courage unquestionable, and rather fearful of fame than danger." These are qualities which abundantly counterbalance the failings of this unfortunate nobleman, whose greatest faults in the eyes of certain writers are, that he was prime minister to Charles I. and the favourite of two monarchs.

Yet, however unpopular the Duke of Buckingham was during his life, the manner of his death was universally detested, and many sincerely lamented him who were most violently opposed to

him [1]. The people recollected his greatness and his splendour, that, in the midst of his errors, he evinced a nature noble and generous, and they detested the barbarous phrensy which had generated the criminal act. These feelings resulted from that conduct which he generally displayed as recorded by the noble historian, that "he was of a most flowing courtesy and affability to all men who made any address to him; and so desirous to oblige them, that he did not consider enough the value of the obligation, or the merit of the person he chose to oblige, from which much of his misfortunes resulted." His bowels were interred at Portsmouth, by his favourite sister, the Countess of Denbigh, who there erected a handsome tablet to his memory: but his body was brought to London, and

[1] All the seditious poets among the Puritans set to work on the occasion of the Duke's death, and endeavoured to display their wit in the way of satire. The following stanzas, though by no means despicable, written by a person unknown, seem to be of this description. They are transcribed from Parliament. Collect. 1620—1628. Lansdowne MSS. 198.

"Some say the Duke was gracious, virtuous, good,
And basely Felton did to spill his blood;
If that be true, what did he then amisse
In sending him the sooner to his blisse?
Pale death is pleasing to a good man's eye,
And none but bad men are afraid to die.
Left he this kingdom to a passage better?
Why, then, Felton hath made the Duke his debtor."

Also, the Sloane MSS. Collect. Pler. Histor. 826, where there are some very amusing effusions.

having lain in state for some days, it was publicly conveyed to Westminster Abbey, and sumptuously interred on the north side of Henry the Seventh's Chapel, where a noble monument is erected to his memory[1].

The news of Buckingham's death reached London on the following day after his assassination. Dr. Richard Montague, whom the Parliamentary faction had persecuted on account of his alleged Popery and Arminianism, had been presented by the King to the See of Chichester, and preparations were accordingly making at this very time for his consecration, at which Laud was to assist the Archbishop of Canterbury, with some other prelates. At the Court of Arches in Bow Church, Cheapside, during the confirmation of the Bishops elect, pub-

[1] Sir Henry Wotton's Life of Buckingham, ed. 1642. Echard's History of England, vol. i. p. 69. Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, p. 523. The following is part of the monumental inscription. "Siste, viator, et, quod ipsa invidia sugillare nequit, audi. Hic est ille, quem reges adamarunt, optimates honorarunt, ecclesia deflevit, vulgus oderunt. Quem Jacobus et Carolus regum perspicacissimi intimum habuerunt; a quibus honoribus auctus et negotiis onustus, fato succubuit antequam par animo periculum invenit. Quid jam peregrine? Ænigma mundo moritur; omnia fuit, necquidquam habuit. Patriæ parens et hostis audit. Deliciæ idem et querela parliamenti. Qui, dum Papistis bellum infert, insimulatur Papista. Dum Protestantum partibus consulit, occiditur a Protestante. Tessaram specta rerum humanarum. At non est quod serio triumphet malitia: interimere potuit, lædere non potuit, scil. has preces fundens expiravit,—Tuo ego sanguine potior, mi Jesu, dum mali pascuntur meo."

lic notice is given concerning those who are to be consecrated in the province of Canterbury, that if any objections can be urged against the election, these must be intimated on a certain day. This intimation being duly given in the case of Dr. Montague, an enthusiast, named Jones, a bookseller, appeared at the head of a rabble on the confirmation day, and tendered his objections against the consecration of the new bishop. He declared that Montague was unqualified and unfit to become a Bishop because he defended Popery, Arminianism, and on account of some other visionary points which he alleged against him. These would have necessarily caused some delay, but it fortunately happened that Brent, the vicar-general of the province, had devolved his office for that day on Dr. Thomas Reeves, whose management disappointed the Puritan enthusiasm. Jones, in his zeal to oppose Dr. Montague, had neglected to prefer his charges in the manner prescribed by law, and the writing being therefore as illegal as the charges were unfounded and fallacious, it was not received by the court. Two days after Montague was consecrated at Croydon; Abbot himself officiating in conjunction with Laud, and the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, and Carlisle. It may reasonably be supposed that Abbot did not assist at this consecration without reluctance, as he knew well that Montague's opinions were by no means favourable to the dogmas of Calvin. But the fact of his assisting at the consecration of a man who had been one of his great opponents, and in

conjunction with Laud, whom he heartily hated, is a sufficient proof that no farther objections were ever afterwards urged against his regularity[1].

Laud was at Croydon, as he himself informs us, when he heard of Buckingham's melancholy fate. On the 30th of August he proceeded to London, "to meet the corpse of the Duke, which that night was brought to London," and on this occasion he received a friendly letter from the King, written, he says, with his Majesty's own hand. The grief which he felt at the fate of his noble friend is pathetically and sensibly expressed in the pious prayers which he composed on that occasion, as inserted in his Manual of Private Prayers and Devotions; and, perhaps, the enthusiast Prynne could not have paid a better compliment to Laud, than when he tells us that the prayers composed for the Duke of Buckingham, which he had the insolence to seize among the Bishop's other private papers, "were much used, as is evident by the fouling of the leaves with his fingers;" and that, "when the Duke was slaine, he made a special prayer on that occasion, much daubed through frequent use with his fingers[2];"

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 745, 746. Heylin, p. 175, 176. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. part i. p. 634, 635. Laud's Diary, p. 43. Neal, vol. ii. p. 180.

[2] Breviat, p. 14. The following is the Prayer which excites Prynne's indignation. "O merciful God, thy judgments are often secret, always just. At this time they were temporally heavy upon the poor Duke of Buckingham, upon me, upon all that had the honour to be near him. Lord, thou hast, I doubt not, given him rest, and light, and blessedness in thee, give also,

even when the same Prynne adduces these facts as proofs that he was a "professed votary and creature to the Duke." But that enthusiast, while he was thus unconsciously bearing testimony to Laud's private worth, had not penetration enough to discover that he could not be "a creature to the Duke" after the death of that nobleman; and the candid mind will admire that fervent piety, which the Bishop's private life more and more unfolds, which induced him to retire to his closet, while surrounded with worldly splendour, humble himself before God, and record those events, that they might enable him never to forget his dependence on the Divine Being.

On the 9th of September Laud went to court, his first visit after the death of his friend. The King received him with more than his wonted affection; and as we find him recording in his Diary a notice of the "gracious speech which the King that night was pleased to address to him," it is highly probable

I beseech thee, the comfort to his lady, bless his children, uphold his friends, forget not his servants, lay open the bottom of all that irreligious and graceless plot that spilt his blood. Bless and preserve the King from danger, and in security in these dangerous times. And for myself, O Lord, though the sorrows of my heart are enlarged in that thou gavest this most honoured friend unto my bosom, and hast taken him again from me, yet blessed be thy name. O Lord, thou hast given me patience. I shall now see him no more till we meet at the resurrection. O make that joyful to us, and all thy faithful servants. Even for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."

that Charles confirmed what he had already expressed by letter, that he intended to entrust him with his confidence in the room of Buckingham [1]. His firm attachment to the crown, and his zeal for the Church, were sufficient recommendations; while at the same time his uniform conduct in good and evil report evinced that conscious integrity of principle which even his enemies could not deny [2].

On the first day of October, the Parliament, which was to meet on the 20th of that month, was farther prorogued to the 20th of January following. Felton, in the mean time, remained a prisoner in the Tower of London, whither he had been brought from Portsmouth, the scene of the tragedy he had acted. His residence there excited a considerable sensation, and many went to behold the man who had been so resolute as to dispatch the most powerful nobleman in the nation. As it was generally reported that he was suborned by the faction who opposed the Duke, many persuasions were used to induce him to confess; but he persisted in declaring that the act was his own, and that he had been solely stimulated to it by perusing the Remonstrance of the Commons [3].

[1] Heylin, p. 177. Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 637.

[2] Sir Edward Dering, his bitter enemy, testified, "that he was always one and the same man,—that beginning with him at Oxford, and so going on to Canterbury, he was unmoved and unchanged—that he never complied with the times, but kept his own stand till the times came up to him."

[3] Laud has been most unjustly charged by Prynne, with

The assassin was examined by the Council, and many solicitations were employed to draw from him a confession, whether the Puritan faction, through the medium of their leaders, had suborned him to commit the crime; but Felton resolutely denied that they had any knowledge of his intentions. He was threatened by Laud, who was a member of the Council, with the rack, if he would not confess; but he calmly replied, that if it must be so, he could not tell whom he might mention in the extremity of torture; and if what he said then was to be held as truth, he might perhaps name his lordship, or some other of their lordships then present.

But Laud has not escaped censure on this subject. It has been insinuated, that he prevailed on the King to ask the judges, whether, by law, Felton could not be put on the rack; to which they returned an answer, that, by the laws of England, Felton could not be racked. Now, while this fact is true in itself, there is not the slightest evidence that Laud had any thing to do with this advice more

writing the answer of the King to this seditious remonstrance, as if he had been the original writer. If Laud wrote it at all, which, as there is no authority save Prynne, may be doubted, though that enthusiast pretends he found a transcript of it in the Archbishop's study, he is not to be charged with the odium which even modern Puritans would attach to him on that account. But the candid reader of that seditious and fanatical remonstrance will at once perceive the absurdity of the positions it assumes, and he will not blame Laud, though he might have written the few mutilated sentences which Prynne has inserted in his Breviat.

than the other members of the Privy Council. Though there is no proof that the Puritan faction had any concern in the Duke's assassination, yet it must be confessed that it did look a little suspicious; especially because Felton himself admitted, that the Commons' Remonstrance had stimulated him to the crime, and this, too, after the King's answer had been known, which Prynne, speaking in the language of the faction, calls Laud's "saucy and scandalous false answer," as written by him: and we know well, that the Puritan zealots were loud in their murmurs, inasmuch as they had just charged the Duke with being the cause of the national misfortunes; and then, secondly, because he was *to be prayed for in London on the following day*, which was Sunday, as one discontented in mind. Felton persisted in declaring that the act was his own; and, from the gloomy religious phrensy of Puritanism which he seems to have cherished at the time, there is every reason to believe that he spoke the truth. But Laud might very naturally (for indeed the notion was general) indulge at first the belief or conviction, that some of the seditious members of the Parliament, or leaders of the Puritans, were privy to the murder, if not accomplices. Nor is he to be charged with offering an advice of that nature to the King, even when his own mind was overwhelmed with grief at the fate of a nobleman who was his friend, since there is no evidence of the fact, and since there is not the slightest notice taken of the particulars, save of the Duke's death,

and by whom it was committed, in the Diary; though in that work, which he never supposed would be published, he has inserted observations on which his enemies have put worse constructions.

Yet, that there seems to have been some plot in contemplation against the Duke is evident, from the expressions of the people, before the assassination, though I admit that Felton's act was his own, and though these very people pitied the Duke, and detested the murderer, who would have rejoiced to have seen the former led to the scaffold, or at least doomed to disgrace. For, after the sanction of the famous Petition of Right, it was generally wished that the Duke should be sent to the Tower, and some were even ready to pull down the old scaffold on Tower-hill, declaring that his Grace should have a new one. Not long after, a retainer of the Duke's, Dr. Lamb, was attacked in the streets of London, and so barbarously treated, that he died the next day, while the rioters declared, that were his master the Duke there, they would give him as much[1]. For this riot, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen were fined 6000*l.* and threatened with the loss of their charter, if they did not bring the rioters to punishment[2].

[1] Collect. Pler. Hist. Sloane MSS. 826.

[2] Echard's History of England, vol. i. p. 65. "The Duke's picture fell down in the High Commission Chamber at Lambeth, which being related to Lady Davis, as foreboding some fatality to the Duke, she replied, *No, his time is not come till August.*" Echard, ut sup.

But the truth of the matter is, that the Council debated on Felton's punishment generally, whether, *by the law of the land,* the prisoner could be racked: and the King being present, commanded the opinion of the judges to be taken on the subject, who, of course, denied that the rack could be employed. Nor in this debate was there any severity, for it must be remembered, that every circumstance had hitherto tended to confirm the suspicion that the Duke's parliamentary enemies were privy to it, and the Council had only Felton's pledge, who, perhaps, might have persisted in his denial from obstinacy. But to have allowed a faction, already too powerful, to exult in secret at the assassination of a minister of the crown, while only one individual appeared as the murderer, was indeed to encourage that daring spirit which had been too often manifested: and, therefore, in inquiring whether there were any law against it, "if it might be done by law," the King himself observed, "he would not use his prerogative on that point." Nevertheless, Laud cannot be blamed for giving advice, as an individual, though there is no evidence that he gave any advice at all. The matter was publicly debated: there were able lawyers in the Council: the answer was as publicly returned: and hence the folly of that remark, that, on this occasion, "crown law was more favourable than crown divinity."

On the 27th of November, Felton was removed from the Tower to the Gatehouse Prison, and on

the same day he was brought by the sheriffs of London to the King's Bench for his trial. He admitted the crime, expressed great penitence, and even tendered his right hand to be cut off, which had struck the fatal blow. This request was refused as illegal. This unfortunate gentleman was executed at Tyburn, on the 29th of November, and his body thereafter sent to Portsmouth, where it was "hung up in chains," says Rushworth, "in manner as is usual upon notorious murderers."

But while Laud was thus sedulously employed in affairs of state, he did not forget Oxford, the place of his education. That venerable and splendid seat of learning, from the classic retreats of which have issued men whose names are immortal, and which, with Cambridge, is at once the boast and the glory of England, experienced in an ample manner the fostering care of one of the greatest of her sons. His intentions towards his University were most liberal and munificent, but it was necessary that he should be in a more exalted situation before he could put them in execution. At present, however, Laud did a signal service to the University. At the annual election of the Proctors, the most factious and tumultuary conduct was frequently exhibited, it being generally carried by a combination of the Colleges, while the weaker parties were in the habit of seeking votes from strangers and non-resident members. The Earl of Pembroke was at this time Chancellor, and he had issued instructions to the University, prohibiting any, save resident members,

to vote in the election to the proctorship. But the proctors for 1627 delivered a formal protest against the letter of their Chancellor; and thus, at the election of 1628, the usual turbulence and rivalry were exhibited. But Laud, with the advice of the King, determined to stop such proceedings in future. For this purpose he drew up statutes, which fixed the election of the several colleges according to their rotation, each college having votes in proportion to the number of members, and extent of the foundation. These statutes were passed in a Convocation at Oxford without a single dissenting voice [1]. He also caused the ancient but mutilated and imperfect statutes of the University, which had lain neglected for some centuries, to be collected and arranged, in order, as he himself says, that a large charter might be procured for Oxford, "to confirm the ancient privileges, and obtain new ones for them, as extensive as those of Cambridge, which they had got since Henry VIII., which Oxford had not [2]." These statutes were printed, and published in Convocation on the 22d of June, 1636 [3]. This zeal for the advancement of learning, and for the welfare of his own University, cannot be too highly commended, more especially when we recollect that this was done amidst his numerous other avocations; when, in fact, he literally had the care of the Church of England on his shoulders. Yet such was the fanatical malevolence

[1] Diary, p. 43, 44. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 183.
[2] Diary, p. 68, 69. [3] Ibid. p. 53.

of the enemies of this truly great man, that at his illegal and disgraceful trial, the above conduct was actually charged against him as one of the enormous crimes for which he was impeached, inasmuch as he took upon himself the office of "universal lawgiver." But Laud replied to this allegation with his accustomed dignity. "No, my Lords," said he, "the great necessities of the University called upon me for it. These statutes lay in a miserably confused heap: when any difficulty arose, they knew not where to look for remedy or direction. Then into the convocation-house, and make a new statute; and that many times proved contrary to an old one concerning the same business. Men, in the mean time, were sworn to both, which could not possibly be kept together. By this means perjury was unavoidable; and themselves confess in their register, (which is now in court,) that till this was done, they did in a sort swear that they might be forsworn[1]."

Nor was this all that Laud did for the University of Oxford. In 1628, he procured two hundred and forty Greek Manuscripts for the Public Library, which he induced the Earl of Pembroke to purchase and present to the University, and Sir Thomas Roe, the celebrated ambassador of King James to the Great Mogul, generously sent him twenty-eight manuscripts in Greek, for the same University, which that statesman had collected

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 304.

at a great expence during his residence in the East[1].

But while Laud was thus employed in advancing the interests of learning in the University of which he was the distinguished ornament, he was no less sedulously attentive to the Church. His situation as Bishop of London gave him an influence which perhaps he would not otherwise have possessed, while his being a member of the Privy Council, and in favour with his Sovereign, enabled him to employ that influence for the best purposes. In order that he might at once put a stop to the disturbances which arose from the preaching of the abstruse and mystical doctrines of predestination, in the preaching of which, as the Church historian well remarks, "many both lost themselves, and bewildered their hearers;" he procured a royal declaration to be prefixed to the Articles, prohibiting all persons who were under the degree of a bishop, and who were priests of the Church of England, administering the holy sacraments, to misconstrue these Articles, or pervert them from their literal and grammatical sense to support the doctrines of Calvin, or of any individual whatever[2].

This Declaration, highly necessary at every period when men are resolved to strain language to support their individual theories, but more especially so in this age of sectarian enthusiasm, is termed by the

[1] Diary, p. 44. Heylin, p. 183. Regist. Cancel. Laud.

[2] Heylin, p. 178, 179. as referring to Bib. Reg. § 4. No. III. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 188, 189.

Puritan historian, the most " confused, unintelligible declaration ever printed ;" which does not say much in favour of that writer's common sense and perception if he did not understand it, though, by the way, he has so miserably garbled it in his Puritan history, that he has contributed his share to make it unintelligible. But yet he contradicts himself, as usual, in the very next sentence ; for he says, that " the Calvinistic divines *understood* the King's intention," which they could not have done, though they were endowed with *extraordinary* powers, if the said declaration had been " confused and unintelligible." It, of course, alarmed the Calvinistic enthusiasts. They declaimed against it as containing the " depths of Satan," as being a " Jesuitical plot to subvert the gospel," an " encouragement and opportunity for Arminians here to sow their tares, and propagate their erroneous doctrines," as tending to suppress all " orthodox books," and to discourage " all godly and painful ministers :" in other words, books full of sedition, which pretended to discuss predestination and reprobation, though in reality their authors made those dogmas much worse than they were before ; and " godly painful ministers," that is, enthusiasts who edified their hearers by those very tenets, who, hurried away by their visionary notions of faith, and implicitly believing in Calvin's inspiration, preached openly against and denounced every one who did not agree with them. Moreover, they presented a petition against this declaration to the King, in which they complained

that they were deterred by this restraint from preaching "those SAVING doctrines of God's free grace in election and predestination, *which greatly confirm our faith of eternal salvation,* and fervently kindle our *love to God;*" and, consequently, that "it will of necessity bring utter ruin to the state by the too bold and frequent disciples and followers of *that enemy of God, Arminius*[1]!"

It may readily be questioned, whether craftiness, ignorance, or folly, preponderated among those who set forth this petition. The King, however, never saw it, as it was suppressed on account of its language by the ministers of state[2]; but it was not forgotten when the Parliament assembled. In the interval between the sessions, Dr. Montague's work, entitled, "Appello ad Cæsarem," and Dr. Manwaring's sermons, were suppressed by proclamation[3]; but this instance of sincerity and candour on the part of the King, the Puritan historian, with his usual charity, declares "was only a feint to cover a more deadly blow to be reached at the Puritans[4]."

It is surprising that the date of this Declaration has been made the subject of misrepresentation and

[1] Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 164, 165. Neal, vol. ii. p. 189, 190.

[2] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 746, 747. Heylin, p. 180. Neal, vol. ii. p. 190.

[3] Collier, vol. ii. p. 747. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 633, 634. Prynne's Cant. Doome, p. 101. The King's Proclamation, Sloane MSS. 826.

[4] Neal, ut sup.

dispute. One writer informs us, that "the Articles were again ratified by King James II. in these words, (the Declaration prefixed in 1628,) which are commonly prefixed to them[1];" and another maintains that the distress of James is exhibited in the "quibbling and equivocal terms in which the Declaration was drawn, thus divided between his principles and his interest[2]." The fact is, that the champions for the Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles maintain that this Declaration was issued not by Charles but by James, for a very natural reason, because they well knew that Calvinism, during James's reign, was prevalent in the Church. Bishop Burnet expressly ascribes the Declaration of 1628 to Charles[3], and so does Dr. Henry Hammond, who in his letter to Dr. Sanderson concerning God's grace and decrees, assigns a reason "both of our Church's moderation in framing the Article of Predestination, and of our *late King's Declaration* in silencing the debate of the question. For if by these methods," says this truly learned theologian, "the Church could but have prevailed to have the dissensions of the several pretenders forgotten, all men contenting themselves, as our Article prescribes, with the promises of God as they are declared in Scripture, (which surely are *universal* and *conditionate, not* absolute and particular,) the turmoil and heat, and imper-

[1] Dr. Burn. [2] Confessional.
[3] Bishop Burnet's Hist. vol. i. fol. edit.

tinences of disputes had been prevented, which now goes for an engagement in God's cause, the bare fervour and zeal in which is taken in commutation for much other piety, by many the most eager contenders. The doctrines being deemed doctrines of God, are counted evidences of sanctified men, and fix the censure of carnality on opposers, and from hence come bitter *envyings*, railings, and at least evil *surmisings*, and these are most contrary to the outward peace of a church and nation[1]." The enthusiast Prynne, bears testimony that this Declaration was affixed by Charles, for he ascribes it to Laud as a crime, alleging that the Declaration "was made by this Bishop's instigation and procurement, and so *generally reputed* not only *at home*, but *abroad*," and he refers to a letter from Dr. Barron of Aberdeen to Laud, which, he says, was found in Laud's "own study, endorsed with his own hand, dated the 20th of April, 1634[2]." And that this Declaration belongs to 1628, is farther proved by Dr. Winchester, and Dr. Gloucester Ridley[3]. Nor is Heylin's evidence to be disregarded, for he lived at the very period. Neal,

[1] Works of Dr. Hammond, folio, London, 1684, vol. i. p. 670, 671. Χαρις και Ειρηνη, or, A Pacific Discourse of God's Grace and Decrees, written to the Rev. and most learned Dr. Robert Sanderson.

[2] Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 160.

[3] Dissert. on the 17th Article, and the "Papers ascertaining the time and reign in which the Declaration before the Thirty-nine Articles was first published." London, 1803.

moreover, who frequently perverts truth, held the same opinion, and directly charges it on Laud, saying, "One of the bishop's first attempts, after his translation to London, was to stifle the Predestinarian controversy, for which purpose he procured the Thirty-nine Articles to be reprinted, with the following Declaration at the head of them[1]." In short, it is indisputable, that this Declaration was passed in the reign of Charles I. and the doubts which have been started only prove to us the fact, that men, even in later times, will frequently attempt to forget facts and dates, to serve the purposes of a party, and to foster their individual prejudices[2].

On the 20th of January, the Parliament re-assembled, "which died issueless," says Fuller, in his own happy manner, "the March following, leaving no acts (*abortions* are no children) completed behind it[3]." Before the meeting, the King had endeavoured to reconcile the contending parties. A Priest, named Richard Smith, who styled himself Bishop of Chalcedon, and who had presumed to exercise Episcopal functions in the kingdom, was prosecuted, and a proclamation issued against priests and recusants. Archbishop Abbot was restored to favour. Dr. Potter, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, "a thorough-paced Calvinian," says Heylin, was promoted to the Bishopric of

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 188.

[2] Vide also Collier, vol. ii. p. 746, 747. Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 141.

[3] Fuller, ut sup. p. 132.

Carlisle, vacant by the translation of Dr. White to Norwich, and proclamations had been issued against Bishop Montague's "Appello" and Dr. Manwaring's Sermons [1]. These measures, it might have been expected, would have conciliated the people, and allayed their enthusiasm; but the spirit of faction had been busily at work, and every action of the King was interpreted to the monarch's disadvantage [2].

But while the King was thus studiously endeavouring to pursue conciliatory measures, he knew

[1] Several distinguished men died in the interval before the meeting of the second session of Parliament. Besides Dr. Toby Matthews, Archbishop of York, already mentioned, died Dr. George Carleton, Bishop of Chichester, whom Dr. Montague succeeded, (Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 131.); Dr. John Preston, one of the heads of the Puritan faction, (Neal, vol. ii. p. 200—203.) a crafty and deep-preaching politician; Sir Thomas Ridley, vicar-general to Archbishop Abbot, (Echard, vol. i. p. 72.); Samuel Purchas, so celebrated for his collections of voyages and travels that he has been called the *English Ptolemy*, (Wood, Fasti. vol. i. col. 200, edit. 1721.); Sir John Dodderidge, a celebrated lawyer and judge, ancestor of the famous Nonconformist, Dr. Dodderidge, (Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. i. col. 519, 520. Beatson's Political Index, vol. i. p. 409. Parliamentary History, vol. viii. 408.); Sir Fulk Greville, Lord Brooke, (Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, p. 523,) who was assassinated by his servant; and Sir John Ley, who, for his abilities, and by his own merit, was created Earl of Marlborough, Lord High Treasurer, and Lord President of the Council.

[1] Echard's History, vol. i. p. 71. Heylin, p. 184, 185. Collier, vol. ii. p. 747. Fuller, book xi. p. 133. Neal, vol. ii. p. 190. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 154, 155. 645. Whitelock's Memorials.

well the danger of allowing the faction to obtain the mastery, nor was he forgetful of his own faithful friends. Sir Richard Weston, who had long served the King, was made Lord Treasurer, he being a minister acute and active, and able to serve the court on emergence, with much greater ability than the Earl of Marlborough, whom he succeeded. Weston, whom the Puritan historian designates a "notorious Papist," was created Earl of Portland, and after the death of Buckingham had possessed considerable influence. In order to strengthen the royal interest, he gained over to the King's party the celebrated Sir Thomas Wentworth, who had co-operated with the Puritans, and was even imprisoned, for not complying with the loan. This great man, better known by his title of Earl of Strafford, distinguished alike for his talents and for his future attachment both to Church and State, was created Viscount Wentworth, and Lord President of the Northern Circuits, by which he was enabled to contend with success against the Saville family, whose interest was considerable in Yorkshire, and also to silence Sir John Elliott, with whom he had been long at variance, in the House of Commons. The attachment of Lord Wentworth to the King is well known. It was about this time that he and Laud commenced a friendship, which remained inviolate until death[1].

When the Commons met, it was expected, since

[1] Echard, vol. i. p. 71. Heylin, p. 184.

the old cause of all their pretended grievances, the Duke of Buckingham, had been removed, that the former jealousies and animosities of the House would be forgotten, and that they would proceed to business as became the representatives of the people. But it was soon found, that they resolved to commence where they ended before the prorogation, and accordingly they occupied themselves for a week in remonstrating with the King about the famous *Petition of Right*, before they could apply themselves to their favourite subject of religion. After receiving a speech from the King on that subject, they resolved to postpone the consideration of the question, though not without expressing their disapprobation. Conceiving themselves as well qualified to decide on theology as on law, they now turned their thoughts to religion [1].

Their virulence was first directed towards Arminianism, being more than ordinarily exasperated by the King's Declaration prefixed to the Articles. It is lamentable to behold men in a summary manner condemning doctrines of which they were utterly ignorant. An idea may be easily formed of the theological notions of the House of Commons from the speeches of the leading enthusiasts on the occasion. On Monday, the 26th of January, 1628-9, the debate commenced, for it was not the fault of the faction that it had not begun on the first day the House met. Francis Rouse, afterwards Provost of

[2] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 645.

Eton, author of a work entitled Mella Patrum[1], and Speaker of Oliver Cromwell's Parliament, thus delivered himself, after speaking in no very measured language of the Church of Rome. "I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that makes the grace of God lackey it after the will of man; that makes the sheep to keep the shepherd; *and makes a mortal seed of an immortal God.* Yea, I desire that we may look into the very belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to *Romish* tyranny and *Spanish* monarchy, for an *Arminian is the spawn of a Papist;* and if there come the warmth of favour upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rise out of the bottomless pit. And if you mark it well, you shall see an Arminian reaching out his hand to a Papist, a Papist to the Jesuit, a Jesuit gives one hand to the Pope, and another to the King of Spain, and these men have kindled a fire in our neighbour's country, now they have brought over some of it hither, to set on flame this kingdom also: yea, let

[1] Besides "*Mella Patrum*," which Rouse published in 1650, he wrote "Archæologia Attica, or Attic Antiquities," 4to. Oxf. 1637. "Speech before the Lords against Dr. Cosins, Dr. Manwaring, and Dr. Beale," 4to. London, 1641. "Speech in opposition to making Dr. Wisniff, Dr. Holsworth, and Dr. King, Bishops," 4to. London, 1642. "The Balme of Love to heal Divisions," 4to. London, 1648. "The Mystical Marriage between Christ and his Church," 12mo. London, 1653. "To all the Faithful Servants of Christ," 4to. London, 1654. "Interiora Regni Dei," 12mo. London, 1655.

us search further, and consider whether these be not the men who break in upon the goods and liberties of this Commonwealth; for by this means they prepare to deprive us of our religion[1]." The gross and ignorant falsehoods of this fanatical orator were fortified next day by the opinions of various other sages, especially Sir Robert Philips, Sir Francis Seymour, and Pym, the last of whom declared, when the report of their committee on religion was made to the House, that there were two diseases, "the one old, the other new: the old Popery, the new Arminianism:" while Philips averred, that "two sects are damnably crept in to undermine the King and kingdom; the one ancient Popery, the other new Arminianism." It is indeed strange that such notorious falsehoods should have been seriously uttered in the English House of Commons. Sir John Elliott, Lord Wentworth's political opponent, was no less furious than his other friends. "In the Declaration," said he, "we see what is said of Popery and Arminianism; our faith and religion are in danger by them, for, like an inundation, they break in upon us at once. We see there are some among our bishops who are *not orthodox*, nor sound in religion, as they should be; witness the *two bishops* (Laud and Neile) complained of at the last meeting of Parliament. I apprehend much fear, that, should we be in their power, we may be in

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 645, 646. Neal, vol. ii. p. 191.

danger to have *our religion overthrown.* Some of these are masters of ceremonies, and they labour to introduce new ceremonies into the Church [1]."

The enthusiasm of these men was quickly communicated to the whole House [2], and they proceeded to pass a vote against the King's Declaration. "We, the Commons in Parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of religion which were established by Parliament in the thirteenth year of our late Queen Elizabeth, which, by the public act of the Church of England, and by the general and current expositions of the Articles of our Church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others, wherein they differ *from us* [3]."

[1] He made, however, a remarkable admission. "Yet some ceremonies," says he, "are useful. Give me leave to join, that I hold it necessary and commendable, that at the repetition of the Creed we should stand up, to testify the resolution of our hearts that we will defend the religion we profess; and in some churches it is added, that they did not only stand upright with their bodies, but with their swords drawn."

[2] A person named Lewis was complained against, for saying in common conversation, "*The devil take the Parliament,*" which was immediately held to be a serious offence, and he was accordingly cited before them. What punishment those sage legislators thought proper to inflict for this *criminal* remark, I have not been able to discover.

[3] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 649, 650. Heylin, p. 180. Echard, vol. i. p. 75. Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 163. Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 747. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 193.

Such was the intolerance of the Puritan faction, and indeed it is hardly possible to give them credit even for sincerity. They were at best a company of secular persons, met together for other purposes, and had no right to interfere with what properly belonged to the Convocation; but since they did assume to themselves the office of "learned clerks," ought they not, instead of endeavouring to reconcile the Articles to Calvinism alone, and in particular, to that absurd and unscriptural jargon, the Lambeth Articles, happily exploded from the Church, to have first examined the Arminian interpretation of the divine decrees, and considered whether it was not more agreeable to Holy Scripture, than the tenets of John Calvin, as founded on the mystical positions of St. Augustine? Had they done this, instead of displaying their fiery zeal for Calvinism, they would have acted in a manner praiseworthy and commendable, without first arrogating to themselves a power to which they were not entitled, and then forcing a construction on language which it would not bear [1].

[1] On this subject the Puritan historian comments in the most absurd manner. He denies that the Commons made a *new* interpretation of the Articles, whereas the fact of determining them to be Calvinistic proves that they did. In reply to Laud's question, If a sense or interpretation be declared, what authority have laymen to make it? Neal says, "The same that they had in the 13th of Elizabeth, to establish them as the doctrine of the Church." Now, though he refers to Collier, and *dissents*, of course, from that learned historian, he has not refuted what that writer has advanced,—that neither the sense of the Articles

It must be remembered, that this "vow" was no act of Parliament. Nay, they unconsciously admit that they had no authority to settle the controversy, for they say, "*We vow* for truth the sense of the Articles which were established by Parliament, in the 13th of the reign of Queen Elizabeth." Now, in their haste "to do the work of the Lord diligently," as they described this conduct, by neglecting other duties, they completely lost themselves, for the expression of individual opinion only in a legislative body in reality implies a want of power. But it is no less remarkable, that amid the general joy manifested by the Calvinistic party on this occasion, the protest being reckoned by them a kind of prodigy, it was thought to be more doubtful and sophistical, and an excuse for greater latitude of interpretation, than had been ever exhibited by any previous expounder.

There can be nothing of greater importance in religion than truth, nor should the seeker of it be restrained by any *dicta,* however great, or powerful.

nor the Articles themselves, were established either by that Parliament, or in any other—that there was *no committee of religion* "appointed to examine the orthodoxy of these credenda, or any resolution of the House upon this report,"—and that "the design of the statute was only to provide against non-conformity, for which purpose the clergy are obliged to subscribe the Articles, and read them in their parish Churches." Our Puritan writer, on the contrary, embraces the opportunity to display his reasoning powers against Bishop Laud; and what do his absurd queries amount to? *Parturiunt montes, ridiculus mus nascitur.*

Laud saw the error of those enthusiasts, and he alone had courage to comment on this extraordinary protest. He saw that their protest was virtually a *challenge,* as Prynne himself calls it, to the King, nor did he allow it to pass unnoticed. "This pragmatical Bishop," says Prynne, "returned this bold peremptory answer, written with his own hand." "1. The public acts of the Church," says Laud, "in matters of doctrine are canons and acts of councils, as well for expounding as determining; the acts of the High Commission are not in this sense public acts of the Church; nor the meeting of few or more bishops *extra concilium,* unless they be of lawful authority called to that work, and their decision approved by the Church. 2. The current exposition of writers is a strong probable argument, *de censu canonis Ecclesiæ vel Articuli,* yet but probable: the current exposition of the fathers themselves hath sometimes missed *Sensum Ecclesiæ.* 3. Will you reject *all* sense of Jesuits and Arminians? May not *some* be true? May not *some* be agreeable to our writers, and yet in a way that is stronger than ours to confirm the Article? 4. Is there by this Act any interpretation made or declared of the Articles, or not? If none, to what end the act? If a sense or interpretation be declared, what authority have laymen to make it? for interpretation of an article belongs to them only that have power to make it. 5. It is manifest there is a sense declared by the House of Commons. The act says, We avow the Article, and in that sense, and all others that agree not with

us in the aforesaid sense we reject, (these and these go about misinterpretation of a sense; *ergo,* there is a declaration of a sense, yea, but it is not a new sense declared by them, but they avow the old sense declared by the Church, the public authentic acts of the Church, &c.) yea, but if there be no such public authentic acts of the Church, then here is a sense of their own declared under the pretexts of it. 6. It seems against the King's Declaration; that says *first,* we shall take the general meaning of the Article: this act restrains them to consent of writers; that says *second,* the Article shall not be drawn aside any way, but that we shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense: this act ties us to consent of writers, which may, and perhaps do, go against the literal sense; for here is no exception, so we shall be perplexed, and our consent required to things contrary. 7. All consent in all ages, as far as I have observed, to an article or canon, is to itself as it is laid down in the body of it, and if it bear more senses than one, it is lawful for any man to choose what sense his judgment directs him to, so that it be a sense *secundum analogiam fidei,* and that he hold it peaceably, without distracting the Church, and this till the Church that made the article determine a sense: and the wisdom of the Church hath been in all ages, or in most, to require consent to articles in general, as much as may be, because that is the way of unity; and the Church, in high points, requiring assent to parti-

culars, hath been rent, as, De Transubstantiatione," &c [1].

These remarks by Laud on the protest of the Commons, which are well worthy the consideration of those who cavil at subscription, were of course treated with contempt by those fiery zealots of Calvinism, and were actually produced against him on his trial as crimes by "Master Prynne." The Puritan historian, says, "Bishop Laud thinks that if the words will bear more senses than one, a man may choose what sense his judgment directs him to, *provided it be a sense*, according to the analogy of faith, and all this to avoid diversity of opinions. But I am afraid this reasoning is too wonderful for the reader." Yet, before Neal chose to entertain such fears, he should first have ascertained in what respect. Truth, I again remark, is important on every subject, but especially in matters of religion. Truth, however, though immutable, and confined neither to Popish conclaves, nor fanatical parliamentary committees on religion, nor religious partisanship, nor to the boast of sectarian hostility, nor to Calvinistic decrees, nor to mistaken and hypocritical evangelism, is nevertheless subject to the variability of human understanding, and, if not controled, is at least affected by local circumstances, by education, connexions, and by association. The gospel, with respect to its funda-

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 163, 164. Heylin, p. 181, 182.

mental principles, must be admitted by all, there being only one *saving faith, one hope, one baptism;* but it is not necessary or imperative, simply because it is impossible, that the same opinions should be held by every man, even respecting some of those great truths which compose the fundamental principles of Christianity, which, in themselves, are essential to salvation, and the men who teach otherwise are of necessity bigots, whether they be Papists or Sectarians. On these points, indeed, the Papists and the Puritans agreed, and their intolerance was in unison; for if the one asserted that there was no salvation out of the Church of Rome, the other asserted every opinion as damnable which was anti-Calvinistic, and those who held them were declared "*enemies to God*," "spawns of Papists," "frogs that rise out of the bottomless pit." It was their grand object, that every man should hold the same opinions on religion as themselves, and this they were determined *to enforce.* But Laud utterly condemned such absurdity, and in this respect he was *liberal,* even in the most general acceptation of the word. The patron of liberality, in opposition to the worse than Popish intolerance of Puritanism, he permitted every man to exercise his own opinions to the utmost latitude, consistent with a true belief in that faith which is apostolical and catholic, not individual, heterodox, and sectarian. And who will deny, that he is the only wise and prudent theologian, the most judicious and the most enlightened, (even though it should excite the fears and the

reprobation of such oracles as the Puritan historian, that "this reasoning is too wonderful for the reader,") "who allows," says a reverend and learned writer on this very subject, "the largest latitude of interpretation consistent with the analogy of the faith, and who enforces mutual forbearance on all, who may yet cordially unite in the public worship of God, in the government and discipline of the Church, and in all the practical obligations of Christian duty, though they may differ very widely in their apprehension of the various truths which they all equally believe, and by which they may be all equally actuated. Such a theologian was Laud, though he has been almost universally represented as the reverse[1]."

I observe farther, on this important subject—important, undoubtedly, as connected with that opprobrium which this great prelate has received, not only from sectarians, but even from that portion of the clergy of the Church who affect to be thought liberal, and who call themselves evangelical, that Laud's enemies who held him to be a bigot were only the Puritans, who having persuaded themselves that *their* principles were the sole marks of genuine truth, were resolved to establish them in the kingdom. If the royal Declaration, which, let it be remembered, did not at all affect private opinions, had been published against those whom they

[1] Life of Laud, apud Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. No. XII. p. 485.

called Arminians and Pelagians, and whom, with the most consummate craftiness, they hesitated not to identify with Jesuits and Atheists, no murmur would have escaped them, they would have rejoiced even if they had beheld the blood of their opponents; but, because this very Declaration was general in its language, and impartial in its application, they declared that they were persecuted,—that their religion was about to be overthrown,—that they were prevented from preaching the "SAVING doctrines of God's free grace in election, and predestination unto life eternal," and other absurd dogmas and tenets of Calvinism. But Laud had more of the Christian disposition than his enemies. He knew well that he, as a man, was at best but a frail and erring mortal, subject to human infirmities and prejudices, and he wished not to make his own theological opinions imperative on the conscience of any man, unless from conviction. Peace and unity were his grand objects, and these, he saw, might be obtained, without compelling all men to think alike, or to become believers in Calvin's dogmas; without these, he saw there was no security for religion and the Church, no safeguard against the ebullitions of partisanship, and the extravagances of heated imaginations. Such was the uniform conduct of the man who has been universally maligned as a bigot, and the encourager of bigotry, whose memory has been called "infamous," by self-righteous sectarians of modern times; while, if

the truth were known, it would be undeniable that he was a century beyond his age in toleration; that he had adopted liberal principles to the full extent: but that unfortunately he was opposed by bigots, every one of whom was an inquisitor in spirit to those who differed from him, and would have been so in reality, had he possessed the power. Not so was Laud, although, as an impartial member of the Church of England, he was no Calvinist, and consequently could not uphold or defend Calvin's "platform." He—*the Arminian Bishop Laud,* excluded not Calvinists from the Church, if they conformed to its ritual and practice; and he bore willing testimony to their merits, their learning, and their conscientious piety. But the bigotted Puritans of that age thought otherwise. With them an Arminian, one who could not believe that God had from all eternity elected some men to life eternal, and doomed others to eternal death before they were born, or had committed any thing to merit such punishment,—such a one was declared to be an "*enemy to his God,* and to his country." Because he believed that all men *may* be saved on repentance, who embrace the gospel through the merits of their Saviour, he was declared to be a "subverter of religion," and, in the elegant phraseology of Puritanism, "the spawn of a Papist,"—"one of those frogs that rise from the bottomless pit;"—that Arminianism "was planted here by the Jesuits," and was "a cunning way to bring in

Popery," and, therefore, all those who inclined to it were in the way of damnation[1]. But we ought not to forget that persecution is the same, whether caused by Popish or sectarian intolerance—that the Calvinistic pyre at Geneva, which consumed Servetus, was as atrocious as the inquisitorial *acts of faith* in Spain or Portugal—and that persecution, in short, is "equally detestable, whether exercised by Popes and their partisans, by Parliamentary Committees aided by preaching zealots, or by General Assemblies led by passionate declaimers[2]."

After having passed their vote, or vow, against the King's Declaration, the Commons bethought themselves of their accustomed fast, without which, it appears, they could transact no business. They professed, that this day of fasting and prayer was in consideration of "the miseries of the Reformed Churches abroad;" yet, though they had been assembled for a week, they did not send their petition to the King until the 30th of January. The famous bill concerning certain duties to be levied on "tonnage and poundage," was then depending in the House, against which a remonstrance had been made when the Parliament was prorogued; nor did the granting of the Petition of Right, which amply guaranteed to the Commons all that they could desire, induce them to consult on the affairs of state, in

[1] Prynne's "Hidden Works of Darkness brought to Light," p. 93, 94, &c. and Canterburie's Doome, p. 159, &c.

[2] Scottish Episcopal Magazine, ut sup.

preference to visionary declamations on religion. The King, finding them inclined to delay, answered their fasting petition to this effect, and with no small disgust: "That the deplorable condition of the Reformed Churches was too true, and their duty was, as much as in them lay, to give them all possible help; but fighting would do them more good than fasting."—"I do not wholly," said Charles, "disapprove of the latter, yet I must tell you that this custom of fasting every session is but lately begun, and I confess I am not fully satisfied with the necessity of it at this time; yet, to shew you how smoothly I desire your business to go on, eschewing as much as I can questions or jealousies, I do willingly grant your request herein; but with this provision, that this shall not be hereafter made a precedent for frequent fasts; and for form and time, I will advise with my lords the bishops." But when the King pressed for the passing of the bill to levy the duties on tonnage and poundage, he was told that they could not "without impiety to God, disloyalty to his Majesty, and unthankfulness to those who sent them, proceed therein, without giving precedency to religion, which was in great danger from Popery and Arminianism." It was in vain that the King assured them, that none could have a greater care of religion than himself. The spirit of dissatisfaction was raised, and it was the endeavour of the Puritan party to increase and extend that spirit as much as possible.

Nothing could now be more evident than that the

Puritans made religion a mere pretext for their designs; and every remonstrance of the King was ineffectual to induce them, as members of the Parliament, to turn their attention to affairs of state. Pursuing this conduct, they proceeded, on the 10th of February, to take the cases of Montague, Manwaring, Cosins, and Sibthorpe, into consideration, to all of whom the King had been pleased to grant pardons. This act of his Majesty was ordered to be discussed, and those ecclesiastics were summoned to appear. Montague was peculiarly obnoxious to them, as it was alleged that he had acted with Laud in advising the King to publish the Declaration. Jones, the individual whose reasons for opposing Bishop Montague's confirmation at Bow Church had been rejected as illegal and irrelevant, preferred an information against that prelate concerning his consecration to the See of Chichester, which of course was received, and, after some debate, was referred to a Committee. Laud and Neile, in fine, were their grand objects of attack; they charged them with procuring those pardons; Sir John Elliott averred in the House, "In Laud and Neile is centered all the danger we fear; for he that procured those pardons may be the author of those new opinions;" and proposed that a motion might be made to petition the King to leave those bishops to the *justice of the House*. It was not without reason that Laud asserted, that this Parliament sought his ruin [1].

[1] Laud's Diary, p. 44.

They did not, however, stop here. Bishop Neile was made the subject of their more particular notice. The reporter of their Committee asserted, that after examination, Drs. Montague, Manwaring, Cosins, and Sibthorpe, had solicited their own pardons through the influence of Bishop Neile, who had promised to obtain the King's consent; and at this time Oliver Cromwell distinguished himself in this fanatical feud. Being a member of this committee, and deeply imbued with the hypocrisy of the age, he asserted that Neile had openly countenanced Popery, by alleging a pretended remark of that prelate addressed to some of his clergy, that there was not so much occasion now, as formerly, to preach against Popery; and two clergymen, his personal enemies, were summoned to prove the fact. The preferment of Dr. Manwaring especially excited Cromwell's wrath. "If these be the steps to church preferment," said the future Protector, "what may *we* expect?"

Various other matters were discussed; the Lambeth Articles were declared by those zealots for the *saving* doctrines of predestination to be the doctrines of the Church of England: warm debates took place concerning the licensing of books, which, however, with numerous other matters, were all referred to the religious committee, so that "by these embarrassments," as Dr. Heylin well remarks, "the Committee for Religion had work enough, more than they knew well how to manage."

Matters were now hastening to a crisis, and the

King was exasperated that this seditious enthusiasm was made to supplant the weightier matters of state. On the same day that the Commons were animadverting on Bishop Neile, their discontentment was farther excited, in consequence of the warehouse of one of their members, named Rolls, being sequestrated by a pursuivant, and he himself served with a subpœna. This person had been most active in opposing the bill for "tonnage and poundage," and had stimulated in a great measure their vigorous proceedings against the officers of the customs. It was in vain that Sir Humphrey May, a member of the privy-council, informed them, that this order proceeded not from the King in council; and although the Attorney-General wrote to Rolls, assuring him that it was accidental, and ought to be overlooked, the ferment was excited, and the Sheriff of London was sent to the Tower. The affair was debated a few days after, and several officers of the Custom-house were examined, and charged with breach of privilege, in violently arresting the goods of a member of the House. But their discussions about reparation to Rolls, and punishment of the offenders, so provoked the King, that to terminate an affair which he foresaw would otherwise be endless, he sent a message, on Monday, the 23d, declaring, "that what the Custom-house officers did, was by his own direct order and command at the council-board." Another debate followed, more severe than the former, in which Laud, Neile, Montague, and the Lord Treasurer Weston, were plainly

hinted at, some of the faction affirming, "that these interruptions proceeded *from some prelates and others*, abettors of the Popish party, who fear to be discovered, and wish to provoke the breach." They then represented to the King, that they were willing to make a distinction between his Majesty's commands and the individual acts of the officers; in other words, they wished him to retract his admission that Rolls had been sequestrated at his instance, by which they would be enabled to punish the offenders. But the King understood the artifice: he thanked them for this shew of respect, but he would not deny what he said were his own orders. This was the signal for a general tumult. Exclamations to adjourn were heard from all sides of the House, and the tumultuous assembly adjourned accordingly until Wednesday.

The breach between the King and the Commons was now irreparable; Charles no longer struggled for supplies, but for the preservation of his power. The Commons met on the Wednesday, but they were adjourned by the King to the 2d of March, not, however, before they found time to read over certain particulars respecting Popery and Arminianism. On the 2d of March they again met, when the Speaker, (after Sir John Elliott had taken the opportunity to deliver a violent declamation,) informed them that he was commanded by the King to adjourn the House for another week. This excited a considerable clamour. They denied that the Speaker had a right to deliver any such

command to them—that they only had a right to adjourn themselves—and that, after they had settled their own affairs, they would attend to the King's business. A general disturbance now took place. One member made fast the door of the House, and secured the key, while another was assaulted with personal violence. The Speaker was ordered to put the question at his peril; but he told them that he was commanded by the King to rise after delivering the royal message. He did so, but some members who were in readiness kept him in the chair by force; and, notwithstanding an attempt made to free him from this violence, a member, the famous Denzil Holles, swore he should sit there till it pleased them to let him rise. No persuasions or entreaties, however, could prevail upon him to relinquish his fidelity to the King, and accordingly Holles was required to read three separate protests; the first declaring that whoever should endeavour to extend Popery and Arminianism, or other opinions contrary to what they conceived to be "the true and orthodox Church," should be declared "a capital enemy to the King and Commonwealth[1];"

[1] I am afraid that at the present day there are many such *enemies* to the state. If I mistake not, among the sectaries, the Wesleyan Methodists profess Arminianism, ergo, according to the Puritan wiseacres, the Wesleyan Methodists must be enemies to the state. Yet, if any were to be so foolish as assert so, if it would not be reckoned downright insanity, I am convinced he would justly get the old-fashioned summary retort, "*Tu mentiris, impudentissime.*"

the second and third setting forth the same denunciation to those who favoured the subsidies of "tonnage and poundage."

These disorders were reported to the King, who, astonished that the House should defy the royal power, and presume to sit after his order for adjournment, sent a messenger for the sergeant-at-arms; but the faction having cunningly secured the door, there was no admittance till the protest was read. The Usher of the Black Rod was then sent to dissolve the House, but he was treated with similar contempt. Exasperated at this pert insult, the captain of the guards was sent with a party to force the door. The faction, however, anticipated this, by tumultuously adjourning till the 10th of March, the day appointed by the King. But the King resolved that they should not renew their disgraceful turbulence, and, accordingly, on the 2d of March, a proclamation was prepared to dissolve the Parliament.

In the mean time warrants were issued against the leaders of this disorder, who had so zealously distinguished themselves, and Holles, Selden, and Sir John Elliott, were committed to the Tower, for refusing to answer for what had been remarked out of the House. They were all sentenced, shortly after, in the King's Bench, to be imprisoned during the King's pleasure. Elliott being the most distinguished delinquent, was fined 2000*l.*, and confined in prison, where he died, in the judgment of

the Puritan historian, "*a martyr* for the liberties of his country." Holles was fined 1000 marks, and others in proportion to their misconduct.

On the 10th of March the King went in state to the House, where, in a wise and eloquent speech, in which he reprobated in strong language the conduct of the Commons, he dissolved the Parliament, and on the following day appeared the proclamation. And to justify himself in the eyes of the nation, his Majesty prepared a Declaration "to all his loving subjects of the causes which moved him to dissolve the last Parliament," which was followed by a proclamation, declaring that the late proceedings of the Commons having "driven his Majesty unwillingly from calling another Parliament, he shall account it presumption for any one to prescribe time for the calling of Parliaments, the calling, continuing, and dissolving of which, being always invested in the King's own person [1]."

Such were the conduct and conclusion of Charles' third Parliament, and with it closed the year 1628. It was during this period that Bishop Williams of Lincoln contrived to commence a friendship with the Lord Treasurer, by endeavouring to heal the divisions of the state: and from this time the King beheld him more favourably, though that prelate did not reside at Court. Laud, however, justly considering himself aggrieved, did not renew his

[1] Rushworth, vol. i. p. 658—662. Appendix, p. 17. vol. ii. p. 3, &c.

intimacy with the Bishop, and Wentworth was by no means satisfied with the Lord Treasurer's conduct, in attempting to bring a powerful rival into favour. Bishop Williams' hopes of reconciling the King and Parliament were disappointed: from this time the breach was irreparable. The King's ministers escaped not the censures of the populace: and Laud and the Lord Treasurer in particular, were singled out as objects of public hatred. The factious religionists of the Parliament secretly exulted in this fermentation, and strove to fan the flame of discontentment. Laud and Weston, since the old object of hatred, Buckingham, was removed, were charged with being the causes of the alleged violent measures of government, and their lives were threatened. On the 29th of March, 1628-9, two anonymous papers were found before the house of the Dean of St. Paul's, which had been privately conveyed there by the Puritan emissaries, the one against Laud, the other threatening the Lord Treasurer. "The one was to this effect," says the Bishop, "concerning myself: Laud, look to thyself; be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of all wickedness, repent of thy monstrous sins, before thou be taken out of the world. And assure thyself, neither God nor the world can endure such a vile counsellor to live, or such a whisperer." The threats against the Lord Treasurer were to the same purpose. And yet, even here does this great Prelate evince his humility and pious disposition. Instead of endeavouring

to discover the author of this abuse, and bring him to merited punishment, we find him mildly noting in his Diary, which he never imagined would meet the public eye, "Lord, I am a grievous sinner, but, I beseech thee, deliver my soul from them that hate me without a cause."

But it was altogether impossible, in that age of strong religious fervour, for the advocate of moderation to escape the popular resentment. Being completely under the control of their crafty leaders, who had signalized themselves by their turbulence in the Parliament, and led by enthusiasts, who, assuming the ecclesiastical function, studiously promoted their seditious schemes, the people forgot their duty to their sovereign, and justified their excesses by indulging their religious and political prejudices. That Laud was most unjustly libelled, and that his enemies in this Parliament were not actuated by conscientious motives, but by a mean and dastardly hatred, cannot be questioned. He was, indeed, a member of the Council, and was the confidant of the King, but there is no evidence that he took any share in the contentions of this seditious meeting, when the members of the English Senate forgot themselves, their Sovereign, and their country. It is easy to excite the clamour of liberality, and nothing is more grateful to the ignorant and obscure, than to be made judges and umpires over the actions of their superiors: but liberality is a term extremely vague and indefinite, nor does it follow that the bursts of popular clamour are the

certain indications of freedom of opinion. In like manner, the gratification of the prejudices of the rabble, which have too often been singularly misnamed the rights of the people, is only a preparation to overthrow the salutary administration of a well-constituted government, by sowing the seeds of sedition, and stimulating the fierceness of hatred. Men are in one sense only born free. They are the subjects of government from the very moment of their birth; they yield a tacit assent to the existing laws; and who will dare to say, that even individual oppression on the part of the state is to be the watchword for a general revolt? In almost every case, the administration of one has advantages superior to that of many: hence, a well-constituted monarchy, the head of which is firm and decisive, terrified neither by the censures of those who affect to be leaders in representative assemblies, nor by the violent bursts of popular clamour, as excited by those leaders under an alleged regard for liberality, is infinitely to be preferred to any species of republicanism. In the one there are unity, freedom, and security; in the other there have been too often manifested distractions and impatience of control, the insolence of sudden elevation, and a gratification of the worst passions at the expence of the natural rights of man. In the former there is order induced by subordination; in the latter there must of necessity be an *imperium in imperio*,—the inevitable result of uncontrouled popular assemblies.

CHAPTER XI.

1629—1631.

The Court of Charles I.—Character of the King—The Queen—Laud—The expediency of ecclesiastics interfering with state affairs discussed—Character of the Marquis of Hamilton—Notice of his life—Character of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Lord Wentworth—Notice of his life—Consequence of Abbot's primacy—The lecturers—Their practices—Cognizance taken of them by the court—Instructions concerning them—Preaching—Its nature and uses—Popular errors on it—Conduct of Archbishop Abbot—Proceedings of Laud—Specimens of the devotions of the lecturers—Prosecutions against them for sedition—Death of the Earl of Pembroke, Chancellor of Oxford—Election of Laud as Chancellor of that University—His munificence and patronage of literature—Birth of Charles II.—Laud officiates at the baptism—Revival of the Predestinarian Controversy—Dr. Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury—Libels against Laud—Story of Dr. Alexander Leighton—His book termed "Zion's Plea"—His degradation and punishment—Defence of Laud—Examination of the Star-Chamber proceedings—The consecration of the Church of St. Catherine Cree—The nature of Religious Ceremonies—The Papists and Puritans—Remarks on Laud's conduct—Farther instances of his munificence.

I HAVE detailed, with perhaps too great a prolixity, the storms and contentions of the first four years of this disastrous reign, and yet, I regret, after all, that my limits preclude me from entering more

fully into this important subject. For to me it appears, that much yet remains to be elucidated of the history of this age, when reason shall triumph over prejudice, and moderation over the yet too visible remains of religious fanaticism. After the dispersion of this Parliament, a comparative tranquillity ensued, which lasted for more than eight years, when the Covenanting zealots of Scotland again excited tumults and distractions, the most fatal and lamentable in their termination.

Here it may not be improper to introduce a few remarks on the Court, which, during the greater part of this reign, was worthy of England for its dignity and splendor. Charles possessed all the characteristics of a great and wise monarch, dignified in his deportment, mild in his appearance, and graceful in his manners. Knowing well that if princes preserve not their dignity they are liable to disrespect, he acted as the monarch of a powerful nation, nor was he inclined to seek an ephemeral popularity by a mere affectation of humility. In conversation he was easy and affable, in argument calm and collected; granting audiences according to the nature of the business; otherwise, as was necessary, making his ministers the channel of communication. He was not rash or hasty in his choice of servants; he observed men long before he admitted them into confidence; and he restrained, by his manner, every appearance of abusing his condescension by forwardness or unwarrantable assumption of power. While he was

not remarkably profuse in his generosity, he failed not to reward those who were attached to his person, and that, too, at an expence which his circumstances frequently rendered difficult. Little need be said of his regard for religion, and its solemn duties, in the practice of which, as has been well remarked, he was more consistent than any other Protestant prince in Europe.

The beautiful Henrietta Maria, on the other hand, did not possess much of her husband's gravity. Educated in a court long famous for its refinement and splendor, and the member of a Church, the solemn services of which, to say the least, are imposing to the imagination, though many of its doctrines are unhappily too liable to be abused by indulgences, the queen was partial to magnificent appearances, delighting to move in that splendid ostentation which attracts and allures the beholder. In her manner, indeed, she was dignified and stately, and even Charles' serious deportment was ascribed to her influence: but she was fond of complimentary effusions, especially in her taste for masquerades and other diversions, which she frequently promoted in the Court. But she had no talents for political intrigue, nor does she appear, unless when under the dominion of priests, before the King dismissed her French attendants, at any time to have taken much concern in public affairs. Hence, French interest did not much prevail in England during the reign of Charles, nor does there appear to have been more than

a mere superficial friendship between the two Courts.

After Buckingham's death, Laud received farther instances of the King's regard, and at last attained the hazardous elevation of prime minister,—an elevation by no means enviable in that turbulent age. He at this time had the chief management of English affairs, for which his firmness, integrity, and knowledge of business eminently qualified him. It has been doubted whether it is reasonable and decent to advance ecclesiastics to the administration of civil affairs: it has been asserted that it is incompatible with their spiritual office: it has been denied that it is conformable to the injunctions of the divine Author of Christianity: and Charles has been blamed and traduced for submitting the public administration to a man whom some enthusiasts have called a bigot, and of "infamous memory." As to Laud's bigotry, or his "infamous memory," it is needless at present to turn the arguments against his contemporary and modern enemies. Yet, while I admit that there is some reason in the previous exceptions, it does not appear that they universally hold. For it is evident that Christianity is an inherent part of the constitution, that all treaties are conducted on its broad and solid basis: and he who has made its doctrines and duties the study of his life, connected with natural talent and capacity for affairs, is by no means ill qualified to superintend, with the same facility as a layman, a government, the public acts of which have, or ought

to have, in a civilized country, one great and ultimate end in view,—the advancement of religion, and, consequently, of the national happiness. Nor am I sure that the civil administration by an ecclesiastic is altogether incompatible with his spiritual office, if it be found that his superintendence conduces to the public good; for such a man is as much a civil member of society, and as much concerned in the public acts of government, as the man who has not the ordination of the Church. As it is the duty of the public minister to promote those measures which tend to the stability of government, and the welfare of his fellow-subjects; these are clearly objects which are not in themselves at variance with his station as an ecclesiastic, but are rather strictly imperative on him as a spiritual pastor. And as to the injunctions concerning Church and State, which some pretend to find in the Christian Scriptures, no analogy can be traced between the days of the Apostles, when Judaism or Paganism was established, and the present times, when Christianity is the law of the land; and, therefore no precedents or arguments for Independency can be thence adduced. The amount of all which the Christian Scriptures contain on this subject is the declaration of our Saviour, that his kingdom is not of this world, but that does not militate against the establishment of Christianity by law: for the Church, although connected with the state, is purely a spiritual kingdom, inasmuch as it is governed by its own laws, which do not interfere with the civil

administration: and hence its members are subject to two jurisdictions—the law ecclesiastical, for spiritual matters, and the law civil, because they are members of society, which law is distinct by itself. In truth, there are no injunctions delivered on this subject in the New Testament: but the future events of government were left to their natural course, except what is contained in that remarkable declaration of prophecy, that, in *the last days*, kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to the Church. If Christianity be a public good, it cannot be wrong to establish it: if it involves man's happiness, its establishment is imperative: if its ministers are to promote this in every respect, their duties are at once understood: so that, although I admit that the objections are not wholly gratuitous, I maintain that those ecclesiastics who may be called to administer in civil as well as spiritual matters, do not perform duties inconsistent with their situation, or act contrary to the doctrines of Christianity.

Laud, as has been remarked, presided over the affairs of England. The second great personage, distinguished alike for his influence and his misfortunes, was James, Marquis of Hamilton, who administered the government of Scotland. This nobleman, the representative of his ancient and noble family, and nearly allied to the House of Stuart, being, in fact, the next in succession to the throne had the royal family become extinct, was the son of James, Marquis of Hamilton, descended lineally from the famous Duke of Chatelherault

and Earl of Arran, who was regent of Scotland during the minority of Mary, his niece, and was distinguished for his subsequent conduct in the defence of that queen, and in opposing her brother, the Earl of Moray. The Marquis was born at Hamilton Palace, in 1606, and educated at Oxford, but he left the University in 1625, the year of his father's death. He had married in his youth Lady Mary Fielding, niece of the Duke of Buckingham[1], but he did not reside at Court, notwithstanding the pressing invitations of the King, till the Duke's death; after which melancholy event, he yielded to the solicitations of the King, repaired to London from the Palace in Lanarkshire, was made Master of the Horse, Gentleman of the Bed-chamber, and a Privy Councillor in both kingdoms. The King's affection towards him, being his relation in no very remote degree, did not elate his mind, or make him forget his illustrious descent. Prudent, wise, and moderate, his influence was great in the royal councils, and though he was thought by

[1] In his youth, for he was at this time eighteen, that is, when he was only fourteen years of age, and the lady seven. This was an expedient of Buckingham's, who was desirous to strengthen his family by great alliances, and who persuaded the Marquis' father to the match. As is usually the case in those political alliances, he did not live happily at first with his lady, but his love to her increased afterwards so much, that she was accustomed to observe, that "she had the greatest reason to bless God for having given her such a husband, whom, as she loved perfectly, she was not ashamed to obey." She died in 1638.

some to be inclined to Presbyterianism, yet he was devotedly attached to the King, and to the Church of England, and he only sanctioned the Solemn League and Covenant in 1641, in obedience to the King, who had been induced to assent to that fanatical bond of the Scots. His favour with the King exposed him to private enmity, "he missed not his share of it," says Bishop Burnet, "from those who were looking on him as the rising favourite; though he bore that character worthily, he managed it prudently, for he neither studied to engross things to himself nor his kindred[1]; he grew not insolent upon favour, nor impatient of competitors: neither did he obtrude himself upon the management of particular affairs, but did rest satisfied with the royal marks of his master's favours, which, upon all occasions, were poured on him liberally." Such was the nobleman to whom the affairs of Scotland were to be entrusted, cautious and politic, of undoubted valour, which he evinced while he served under the famous Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, before he entered upon an administration turbulent in itself

[1] Compare this with Archdeacon Echard's assertions, that "he had a mighty influence upon the greatest affairs at court, especially when they related to his own countrymen," and that, "by his influence, and the King's fondness towards his native country, the court became filled with Scotchmen, who obtained places and revenues to a proportion that was thought against all the rules of reason and policy." I believe the Archdeacon has followed Clarendon and Heylin in these assertions.

and fatal to him in its consequences, during which foreign service he acquired a greater degree of wisdom and valour, which made him to be reckoned a more dangerous enemy than he really was [1].

The third great personage at the court, and to whom were to be committed the affairs of Ireland, was the famous Wentworth, afterwards the ill-fated Earl of Strafford, the intimate friend of Laud, who was destined, like that great Prelate, and the Marquis of Hamilton, to die the victim of oppression, rebellion, and cruelty. This great and extraordinary man, whose abilities were so eminent, as to make Cardinal Richelieu, in a transport of indignation against the English, declare him the wisest head in the nation, was descended from an ancient and honourable family in Yorkshire, which had been settled in that county since the time of the Conqueror, in whose Doomsday Book the name of Reginald de Wintwade occurs [2]. He was the eldest son of Sir Thomas Wentworth, of Wentworth Wodhouse, Yorkshire, and of a daughter of Robert Atkinson, of Stowell, Gloucestershire, a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, at whose house, in Chancery-lane, London, he was born on Good-Friday, April 13, 1593. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, the foundress of which noble college was one of his ancestors. Upon the death of his father, in 1614, he succeeded to an estate in those

[1] Bishop Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, &c. folio, London, 1678, p. 1, 2. 4. 406, 407, 408.

[2] Collins' Peerage, vol. ii. p. 20, 21.

days of 6000*l.* per annum, with the title of Baronet, conferred by James I. on his father, who had been the twenty-second since the institution of that order[1]. In 1615, he was Custos Rotulorum for Yorkshire, and in 1621, one of the representatives for the county. In 1622, his lady, a daughter of the Earl of Clare, died, and, in 1624-5, he married Lady Arabella Holles, a lady of great personal and mental accomplishments. On the accession of Charles to the crown, he represented Yorkshire in the first Parliament, in which he advocated the enthusiastic measures of the Puritan faction, though he still preserved his respect for the King, which those religionists had unfortunately forgotten; and that Charles did not view him in the light of an enemy, is evident from his nominating him one of the seven who were appointed to serve as sheriffs in 1625. He was removed, however, by the interest of the Duke of Buckingham, while discharging the duties of his office, which increased his opposition to the Court, and prompted him to aid in impeaching the Duke[2]. In 1627 he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea, and then confined to a circle of two miles round Dartford in Kent, for refusing to comply with the loan. After six months' restraint, he was elected to represent Yorkshire in the King's third Parliament, in which he distinguished himself by promoting the famous

[1] Dedication of Strafford's Letters, &c., by Dr. Knowles, and Sir G. Radcliffe's Essay, apud Appendix.

[2] Collection, vol. i. p. 2, 3. Letters, 34, 35, 36.

Petition of Right, which being granted by the King, he ceased his opposition, perceiving that the faction whom he had aided were not actuated by their pretended motives of disinterestedness: and he took every occasion of expressing his disapprobation of their proceedings [1]. Being reconciled soon after to the Duke, he was offered a peerage, which he at once accepted, and was created Baron Wentworth, on the 22d of July, 1628 [2]. This excited a considerable speculation among the people, and especially amongst the Puritan faction, one of the chiefs of which, Pym, with whom he had formerly acted, said to him, on a certain occasion, "You are going to be undone, but remember, that though you leave us now, I will never leave you while your head is upon your shoulders." The surprise caused by his elevation was farther increased by his being created a few months afterwards a Viscount, made a member of the Privy Council, and Lord President of the North, on the resignation of Lord Scroope [3]. In this latter situation he endeavoured to repair the mischievous effects of the negligence of his predecessor, and he now devoted himself entirely to the King. The wisdom, fidelity, and activity of this great statesman, farther recommended him to

[1] Letters of Lord Strafford to his brother-in-law, Denzil Holles, Collection, vol. i. p. 40, 41.

[2] Strafford's Letters, vol. i. p. 47, vol. ii. p. 430.

[3] Letters, ut sup.

Charles, who, at the death of Buckingham, made him one of his chief confidants and advisers. At this time, too, his extraordinary friendship with Laud commenced, which continued unabated till his death. No two men were ever brought into contact with each other whose principles and feelings were so much in unison. The same integrity, the same devotedness to church and state, the same firmness and decision, the same affection for their royal master, the same opposition to the extravagances of Puritans and Recusants, distinguished each. In short, their tempers, inclinations, and principles, as well as the modes of public administration, were in unison; they possessed every thing which Cicero so eloquently enumerated as essential to a lasting friendship. No part, perhaps, of the history of this momentous period is more interesting than the correspondence between these illustrious men. The character of Wentworth, although it has been calumniated and vilified by his enemies, requires little delineation. Temperate and frugal, affectionate and kind, in his public and domestic concerns, he was profoundly skilled in the laws of England, and he died a martyr for the altar and the throne. His prudence was well known, few excelled him in eloquence of speech. Though naturally choleric, he endeavoured to repress his temper, and he loved those who reminded him of his weaknesses. "He was a man," says Sir George Radcliffe, "and not an angel, yet such a man

as made a conscience of his ways, and did endeavour to grow in virtue and victory over himself, and made good progress accordingly[1]."

Such were the three personages who were most distinguished at the court in that turbulent age; and the latter it is not, perhaps, improper to introduce as connected with Laud, inasmuch as they were all involved in the general catastrophe of this disastrous reign, sealing with their blood their loyalty to the King—the victims of daring rebellion and ambition. On the characters of the other ministers of Charles I. it would be out of place to expatiate. Laud, Hamilton, and Wentworth, though not accountable for the imprudences of the inferiors, were at the helm of affairs.

The year 1629 passed away, with little of importance in the life of this great prelate. Diligent in the discharge of his episcopal jurisdiction, and adorning by his firmness and piety that high station which the See of London secures, Laud was not the man to be deceived by the intolerant pretensions of the popular leaders, men of narrow views and violent enthusiasm. On the 13th of May, the Queen was delivered of a son, who survived only a few hours, and Laud presided at the funeral the next day in Westminster Abbey. The remainder of the year was to him a season of personal affliction. On the 14th of August, on his way to Woodstock, he

[1] Sir G. Radcliffe's Essay, apud Appendix to Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 433—436.

fell into a fever at the house of one of his friends named Windebank, where he lay till the 20th of October, in an almost hopeless condition. On the 29th, he was enabled to return to London House, but, still continuing weak, he again relapsed, nor did he completely recover till the end of the ensuing March.

But while Laud was thus confined by sickness, his active mind was constantly employed. The advancement of religion he rightly conceived to be identified with the stability of the Church, and if the Church fell, there was no barrier against fanaticism and every species of sectarianism. Abbot, who, notwithstanding the Puritan testimonies to his mildness and liberality, was undoubtedly possessed with a spirit of sectarian intolerance, had contributed much to weaken the Church by his government. "No friend was he to the Church of England, whereof he was the head," says Aubrey, "but scandalously permitted that poisonous spirit of Puritanism to spread all over the whole nation, by his indolence, at least, if not by his connivance and encouragement, which some years after broke out, and laid a flourishing Church and State in the most miserable ruins, and which gave birth to those principles which, unless rooted out, will ever make the nation unhappy[1]." At this time his age had increased his remissness: his house, as has been already observed, resembled a conventicle rather

[1] Antiquities of Surrey, vol. iii. p. 287.

than the house of a Protestant Bishop; a puritanical silence reigned within its walls, and he was himself rendered gloomy and austere by the spirit of Calvinism, which induced in that age a kind of religious stoicism. The Bishops were permitted to live at their ease apart from their dioceses: but chiefly was danger apparent from the host of itinerating lecturers, and others who had been ordained, harbouring in the houses of private individuals as chaplains, who made it their business to undermine the Church, proceed from place to place inflaming the zeal of the people, and were in a manner removed from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by not having regular benefices. Against these men, generally ignorant and violent enthusiasts, it was necessary to be specially guarded, because they endeavoured by every means to revive the predestinarian controversy, which had been already productive of so much mischief. Even the testimony of the Puritan historian, though designed to serve a different purpose, is conclusive that their suppression was absolutely necessary. They inveighed in their sermons against every thing which did not meet their fancy, "they were strict Calvinists," says Neal; and then he adds, as if the exclusive consequence of Calvinism, they were "warm and affectionate preachers, and distinguished themselves by a religious observance of the Lord's Day, by a bold opposition to Popery and the new ceremonies, and by an uncommon severity of life. This affectation of piety and austerity excited the applause of the ignorant mul-

titude, who were delighted to hear the regular clergy reviled by those itinerating preachers; and, to crown all, they were openly patronised by Abbot, who, whether from conviction, or some other cause, thought that they, and they only, had the Protestant religion at heart, and would fortify their hearers against the return of Popery[1]." In other words, they fell into the opposite extreme of fanatical extravagance, and justified Laud's observation, that they were dangerous enemies to the state, because by their extempore prayers and sermons, which they amply mixed with their private prejudices, they awakened the dissatisfaction of the people, and excited the popular clamour.

In order that the evils resulting from this vagrant preaching might be timely averted, in the month of December, 1629, after a correspondence between Laud and Dr. Harsnet, Archbishop of York, who had succeeded Montaigne, before the latter, to adopt the phrase of Heylin, *had half-warmed his chair*, certain articles were drawn out, and submitted to the King, who, sensible of their importance, immediately signed them when they were presented by Laud. These were immediately dispatched to Archbishop Abbot, under the title of "His Majesty's Instructions to the Most Reverend Father in God, George, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, containing certain orders to be observed and put in

[1] Heylin, p. 188, 189. Parliamentary Hist. vol. viii. p. 209, 210. Rushworth, part ii. p. 30, 31.

execution by the several Bishops in his Province." The sum of these instructions was simply the ordination of proper persons, and nine particulars were submitted to the attention of the Bishops—that there should be a diligent catechizing on the Sunday afternoons by the clergy—that the lecturers conduct divine service according to the Liturgy of the Church, and in the proper canonicals—that the lectures in market towns be preached by orthodox divines of the diocese—that every lecturer maintained by a corporation be not suffered to preach till he profess his willingness to take upon himself a cure of souls—that the bishops should use every means to obtain a personal knowledge of the lecturers—that none but persons qualified by law entertain private chaplains—that public prayers and catechisings be diligently performed, and notice taken of absentees and recusants—that the bishops shall not dispose of the Church lands by leases, in prejudice to their successors—and that an account of these instructions be rendered on the 2d day of January every year. These instructions, it will be admitted by every impartial mind, were not only salutary in that age of religious knavery, but highly beneficial to the advancement of rational piety, apart from the extravagances of enthusiasm and private interpretation. It is a trite remark, first made, I believe, by the illustrious Bishop Bull, that a mere preaching church cannot stand: and wherever there is too much respect awarded to human effusions, in preference to the more solemn duties

of prayer and praise, and catechising the young and ignorant, there are infallible indications of something wrong. On this point, too, the Romish Regulars and the Puritan enthusiasts, like the modern Methodists, remarkably agreed [1]. Preaching was the grand resort of the Puritans, as it was of the Regulars; in many cases the worship of God was sacrificed to a gratification of their rhetorical propensities; and stimulated as they were by a violent opposition towards the Church, their effusions abounded with their individual opinions. They forgot that the sermon is *no part of public worship*,—that it is the least of all the other important duties of a faithful minister; and they excited in the populace that desire for hunting after novelties which is one great feature of schismatical separations. Hence, their votaries disregarded the very essentials of Christianity, and placed their sole dependence on the compositions of the orator. With them it was not he who was the most moderate, diligent, and pious, but he who made the greatest noise, who displayed the greatest apparent fervor and gesticulation, whose *pedestris copia* was most agreeable to their enthusiasm, and who declaimed against and denounced the regular clergy, that was certain of popular applause [2]. In this there is a

[1] Bishop Lavington's Enthusiasm of the Methodists and Papists considered, 8vo.

[2] A similar class of rhetoricians obtained both at Athens and Rome in ancient times. In the former city were the Sophists, who eventually accomplished the death of the virtuous Socrates, who penetrated their designs, and exposed them to ridicule—a class

striking resemblance to the religionists of the present day, who are continually on the search after novelty, who seem to place their faith on the sentiments of their favorite orator, and who delight in gaudy parade, fulsome compliment, and vain ostentation in certain public assemblies.

I would indeed regret were I to say any thing against the ordinance of preaching, for I believe it in itself a most important duty, but the opinion of the great and good Bishop Bull on this subject, with whose sentiments every clergyman ought to be familiar, is to me quite conclusive. It was a most dangerous principle which obtained in the days of Puritanism, as it does now, to call the composition or the sentiments of any frail and erring mortal *the Gospel,* to despise every other minister who does not indulge in the same style of phraseology, and who does not delight to appear in certain public assemblies to receive the greetings of religious partisans. For true religion consists neither in a fancied evangelism, nor in extravagant gesticulation, nor in an impassioned delivery, nor in a

of men concerning whom Plato remarked, "Let us give them crowns, only to turn them the more honourably out of our dominions." Had Quintilian heard the oratorical displays of the Puritans, he could not have described them with better effect than in the language he has employed, Inst. lib. ii. cap. 12. "Clamant ubique, et omnia levata (ut ipsi dicunt) manu emugiunt, multo discursu, anhelitu, jactatione, gestu, motuque capitis furentes—mire ad pullatum circulum facit—cum ille eruditus modestus et esse, et videri malit—at illi hanc vim appellant, quæ est potius violentia."

peculiar religious phraseology, nor in the parade and bustle of missionary assemblies; and still less does it consist in merely popular discourses, to which the religionists repair, not for the purpose of worshipping God, that is, for prayer and praise, for if there were nothing else they would not go at all, but to hear their favourite orator, to be delighted by his eloquence, manifesting the utmost impatience till he makes his appearance. What! shall the public service of God be prostituted for the gratification of human passions? Shall men and women, possessed of immortal souls, proceed to the Christian temple as they would do to the arena of florid declamation, compliments, and religious partisanship? Shall they dare to be impatient during that holy service of praise, prayer, and reading of the inspired canon, which the wisdom of the Church has enjoined, until the idol of popular applause appear and commence his rhetorical harangue? And shall they hang on the words of a sinful man, and place them above the reading of the gospel message? It is sickening and deplorable. How different is true religion from such lamentable fanaticism and daring contempt of Heaven, both in the preacher and his adherents! Quiet and unobtrusive, true religion takes up its abode in the heart, shunning all ostentation and popular applause, disdaining the ephemeral celebrity of dangerous and misguided zeal, and teaching its possessor to direct his humble aspirations towards Heaven, *to reverence the sacred and venerable*

institutions of the Church, and to guard against that hollow liberality which is as superficial and evanescent as the morning dew.

The King, as well as Laud, was extremely suspicious of those itinerating lecturers, and not without reason, as will immediately appear. Lecturers were of three classes—those who were obtruded into the cures of the regular ministry, and endeavoured to engross the popularity of the people, —those who held combination lectureships, who preached in rotation in a market-town,—and running or itinerating lecturers, who preached first at church, then at private houses, then in the adjoining parishes, and so on, the preacher, after abusing the institutions of the Church, and declaiming against its doctrine and discipline, always announcing to his satellites where he was next to be found. Such irregularities deserved especially to be suppressed; yet Archbishop Abbot thought otherwise, for though he was obliged to communicate the instructions to his suffragan Bishops, he did so only in an *official* manner, but in private he acted in direct contrariety, determined to patronise his friends, and thus affording another instance of his disregard for the Church. Dr. Kingsly, Archdeacon of Canterbury, conformably to the official instructions he had received from the Metropolitan, suspended two preachers, named Palmer and Udney, for refusing to conform to the King's directions. The one was lecturer of St. Alphage, Canterbury, the other of Ashford, in the same diocese. They

were both charged with having no licence to preach, officiating against the inclinations of the incumbents, catechising against the terms of the canon, misinterpreting the King's instructions, refusing to read prayers, or to wear the surplice; and Palmer, in particular, had preached a seditious sermon in the Cathedral, had spoken in contempt of the service of the Church, and had all the seditious persons in the neighbourhood for his auditors. Yet Abbot, to shew his authority, and his favour for the zealots, not only authorized them both to resume their lectureships, but prohibited the Archdeacon to take cognisance of them, and frowned on those who presumed to animadvert on his conduct. No step could have been more impolitic, even admitting that the lecturers were harshly treated. It could not fail to increase the boldness of the faction, and when the above-mentioned seditious behaviour was thus openly patronised, it was not to be thought that they would confine themselves to general declamations.

"If a house be divided against itself," saith the Divine Founder of Christianity, "it cannot stand," and of the truth of this, the Church of England at this period afforded a melancholy example. The vigour of its friends was counteracted by such proceedings, and the Church sapped at its foundation. Abbot's conduct was reported at Court, and, of course, it was duly censured: but it was thought most expedient to pass it over in silence, on account of his infirmities, and the moroseness of his

disposition. But Laud determined to investigate the state of his own diocese, more especially as in the metropolis numbers could conceal themselves for a time, and carry on their designs. The clamours of the Puritans against these instructions were great: they declared that they were intended to suppress preaching altogether; and with them every thing depended on sermons. The diminishing of the number of private chaplains offended as well those who entertained them as the chaplains themselves [1]; while even the poorer bishops were by no means satisfied at being obliged to betake themselves to their remote dioceses, where they were subject to an expence which their revenues could not bear. As to the Puritan lecturers, nothing could annoy them more than to be compelled to catechise; they had always derided and neglected this most important duty, or treated it with contempt, thinking that sermons on their favourite topics of election and predestination were admirably adapted for persons who, in truth, required to be instructed in the first principles of religion. To wear gown and surplice was a dreadful punishment to them, while they equally deprecated being restricted to a cure of souls, as by that means they would be deprived of their popularity.

[1] Heylin, p. 191. "Nor were the chaplains better pleased than their masters. For having lived upon hard commons, and perhaps under some smart discipline also in their halls and colleges, they thought they had spent their studies to good purpose, by finding ease and a full belly in those gentlemen's houses from whom there was some possibility of preferment, which better scholars than themselves might have otherwise hoped for."

But Laud summoned them before him, pressed upon them the necessity of these instructions, informed them that he was determined to put them in execution, and directed letters to all his Archdeacons to the same effect, as did all the other bishops, "but slackening by degrees, when the heat was over," says Heylin, "possibly in a short time they had not been looked into at all, if Abbot had continued much longer in the See of Canterbury, or if his Majesty had not enjoined the bishops to give him an exact account of their proceedings in the said particulars, not once for all, but annually, on the second of January."

The conduct of those lecturers made this cognizance absolutely necessary, as will appear from the following specimens of their devotions and instructions. One Nathaniel Barnard, lecturer of St. Sepulchre's, London, prayed thus before his sermon, "Lord, open the eyes of the Queen's Majesty, that she may see Jesus Christ, whom she hath pierced with her infidelity, superstition, and idolatry[1]." For this he was of course called to ac-

[1] This same preacher, however, abused Laud's leniency, who had merely dismissed him on his expression of sorrow. Three years afterwards, he preached a sermon before the University of Cambridge, from 1 Sam. iv. 21, in which he declared that Romish superstitions were introduced into the Church. Being called into the commission court for introducing subjects foreign to his purpose, and for making assertions which he could not prove, he dogmatically refused to retract, and was accordingly suspended, fined 1000*l*., and committed to prison. Rushworth, vol. ii. Part ii. p. 140, 141, 142. Hume's History, vol. vi.

count. Charles Chaucey, vicar of Ware, declared in his sermon, that "idolatry was admitted into the Church,—that the preaching of the gospel would be suppressed—that there is much Atheism, Popery, Arminianism, and heresy crept into the Church." His case was remitted to Laud, and all that the Bishop required of him was to make a submission in Latin [1]. Sharpe, one of the prebendaries of Durham, preached a fiery sermon from the passage of Scripture, "I hate all those that love superstitious vanities, but thy law do I love:" which harangue was occasioned by some paintings in the Cathedral of Durham. This occasioned his committal to prison, deprivation of his prebend, excommunication, and fine of 500*l*. One declared in his sermon, that the gospel stood on tip-toe, and was departing to New England: while others indulged in metaphorical language, and affected to speak in parables and prophecies. Some preached long sermons against windows of stained glass, which they reckoned an awful innovation; and a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, who will be more particularly noticed, was prosecuted for imitating the actions of his violent friends, and, by a daring and sacrilegious outrage, demolishing a painted window in St. Edmund's Church,

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 34. This preacher, also, six years afterwards, thought proper to distinguish himself by opposing the railing of the communion-table in the parish church, "as a snare and innovation to men's consciences." He was also fined, and imprisoned, but again dismissed, on promising submission. Rushworth, ut sup. p. 316.

Salisbury, though he and his confederates had been warned by the Bishop. He was fined 500*l.* and removed from his office of Recorder of Salisbury. In short, their insolence and outrages were so indecent, as to become intolerable; the regular clergy, who, in the faithful discharge of their duty, confined themselves to the Liturgy and Homilies, were called Dumb Dogs; and the bishops, Men of blood, Followers of Antichrist.

Perhaps, in some cases, the punishments exceeded the offence, abstractedly considered; but, it must be recollected, that the offence was rendered more heinous by the obstinacy of the offenders, and that it was necessary to restrain the seditious enthusiasm which was studiously excited among the people. In that age of religious zeal, those disaffected preachers made it their constant practice to lecture from the Jewish Scriptures, and they chose all those passages which at once informed their auditors of the opinions they were to advance. It is, indeed, difficult to prove that the Puritans had any extraordinary regard for religion, or were actuated otherwise than by determined opposition; for who will justify men who made the pulpit, from which ought to be proclaimed the solemn truths of man's salvation, the place for uttering their political and religious prejudices, courting partisans, and gratifying the vulgar notions of the rabble? And yet this was invariably their practice, which they were enabled to do with great facility, by indulging in extemporaneous effusions. Hence it is,

that while all the productions of the Church at that period, with the exceptions before specified [1], have no bearing at all on the public distractions, save the general inculcation of peace and unity, the Puritan performances are, to a greater or less degree, the monuments of that determined hatred which they continually evinced. And if men will so far forget themselves as to blend political prejudices with the great truths of Christianity, and endeavour to find precedents in the history of Palestine for exciting the fanaticism of the multitude on the passing events of the day, thereby encouraging disaffection and inflaming the popular discontent, surely no visionary declamation concerning liberty can restrain a civil government from taking cognizance of such malcontents, nor is it inconsistent with the spirit of freedom to make examples of them to others. At least, it ought not to be forgotten, that the leaders of a faction are the most dangerous enemies of good government, which ought to promote and maintain respect for established institutions, and not to sacrifice these by a pretended liberal remissness, for the purpose of gratifying the whims and the prejudices of disaffected religionists.

The year 1630 was introduced by an event which procured for Laud new honours, and enabled him to display his generous disposition by fresh acts of munificence and splendor. On the 10th of April, the Earl of Pembroke, Chancellor of the Univer-

[1] Doctors Sibthorpe and Manwaring.

sity of Oxford, died suddenly of apoplexy, and Laud was elected to succeed him, though not without some opposition. The faction opposed to him, insignificant, indeed, at the head of whom was the Bishop of Lincoln, his old enemy, proposed to elect the Earl of Montgomery, Pembroke's brother, and the four Colleges in the visitation of that bishop, namely, Baliol, Oriel, Lincoln, and Brazennose, accordingly endeavoured to promote an opposition. But, on the 12th, a Convocation was held, and Laud was chosen Chancellor of the University[1]. On the 28th, in solemn Convocation at London-house, he was invested with the authority of his high office, with the applause of the King, who testified that he knew none more worthy of that office than the Bishop of London. Laud well deserved this mark of respect, both from his eminence, and from his activity and diligence in discharging the important duties, the University being "ex-

[1] In the election of Laud to the Chancellorship, the party against him was thought to be more numerous (Wood, Antiq. Oxon. vol. ii. p. 368): and Prynne, therefore, asserts, (Canterburie's Doome, p. 71,) "that by indirect means he procured himself to be elected Chancellor, and that the noble brother to the Earl of Pembroke, was then really elected by most voices, though miscalculated by practice in the scrutiny by this prelate's creatures." But this is not the case, for Pembroke's death was sudden and unexpected, and Laud could not possibly have time to employ "indirect means," because Pembroke died on 10th of November, and he was chosen Chancellor on the 12th, nor did he know that he was chosen till it was formally notified to him. (Diary, p. 45.)

tremely sunk from all discipline, and fallen into licentiousness." The great patron of learning and religion, the promoter of salutary government and discipline, and the munificent benefactor to all institutions of piety and charity, it was right that he should be placed in a situation where the beneficent activity of his great mind would be unrestrained. From this time forward, it was his study to adorn that splendid seat of learning with sumptuous buildings, to enrich it with most valuable manuscripts, which he spared no expence to procure, and with books of the greatest value. These are actions which ought to atone for many imperfections. Unfortunately, this great man lived in an age when his genius and his worth were appreciated only by a few: but, had his lot been cast in an age when reason and genuine religion prevailed over enthusiasm and affected purity of doctrine, who would have dared to impeach his illustrious character, or have exposed himself to contempt and indignation, by pronouncing his memory "infamous?"

Religious bigotry and a love of learning and literature are very rarely combined in the same person. Bigotry depends on ignorance for support; it is identified with intolerance, and intolerance exists chiefly where ignorance prevails. But the man who pretends to establish bigotry, which, however, like the term *liberality*, is extremely vague and capable of various definitions, must unquestionably be disappointed in his speculations, at least if he

attempt to introduce that species of bigotry to which I allude, which was practised to the very letter by the Church of Rome, the English Puritans, and the Scottish Covenanters. For that is only bigotry, I conceive, which induces us to imagine that there is no salvation out of the communion to which we are attached; but that cannot be bigotry which asserts that there is salvation both out of Rome and out of a Conventicle, and which induces us to adhere to the Church, and to oppose the arts of designing men, who, in their endeavours for power, would overthrow and trample under foot the most sacred institutions. When men are stimulated by bad passions, or by the bitterness of disappointment, they forget the respect due to antiquity in their attachment to ideal novelties; they forget that a venerable structure may remain while its interior is purged from the grosser corruptions; they forget that antiquity has a voice above modern innovations, yea, even *tradition* above fanciful modern notions. Laud, by his patronage of learning, could not, in the nature of things, be a bigot, and consequently he was not intolerant, otherwise his actions betrayed an erroneous calculation. "But his princely magnificence," says Ockley, "in being at prodigious expence to restore Oriental learning in these northern climates, both by purchasing such an excellent collection of authors in the East, and encouraging men of abilities to apply themselves that way, cannot, without the greatest ingratitude, be

passed over in silence, by any one that has due regard to Oriental learning [1]." His munificence in this and other respects, from the year he obtained the Chancellorship of Oxford, till the day that he sent his pious and affecting resignation of that high office from the Tower, will be hereafter particularly mentioned. No fewer than *thirteen hundred MSS.* did this great man present to the University of Oxford, in the *Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, Egyptian, Ethiopian, Armenian, Persian, Arabic, Russian, Turkish, Japanese, Chinese, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Saxon, English, and Irish languages,* as the inscription in the Bodleian Library sets forth. Who can calculate the expence of this collection, or the means by which it was acquired! It would seem to require a lifetime to be employed in a work so praiseworthy to himself, so honourable to the English nation and to the University of which he was the head and ornament.

Being thus installed Chancellor of his own University, Laud's activity and noble works were soon conspicuous. Some weeks afterwards, he was called to discharge another duty, the appointment to which was honourable to himself. On the 29th of May, 1630, a day subsequently ever-memorable in the annals of England, the Queen was delivered of a prince at St. James's, afterwards Charles II. Laud was in the palace at the time, and within an

[1] Simon Ockley's Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens, 8vo. London, 1708, vol. i. pref. p. xviii. xix.

hour after the birth of the future heir of the House of Stuart, whose youthful years were destined to be clouded by adversity and exile, he held the infant prince in his arms. On June 27, he officiated as Dean of the Chapel Royal, and baptized the Prince, though that office belongs exclusively to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the sovereign and his family being reckoned parishioners of the metropolitan, who, in virtue of his office, ought to attend in the royal household on these important occasions. But Charles had not been an inattentive observer of Abbot's conduct, and the patronage which he had awarded to Palmer and Udney was by no means agreeable to the monarch. Avowed personal hostility between Abbot and Laud had ceased. The former had seen all his opposition to ruin the latter unavailing, and the gloominess of his disposition operated with the infirmities of age to make him live in retirement. Laud modestly excuses him by saying that he was then "very infirm," which was the fact; but perhaps Heylin's observation is correct, that at court "his company was not very desirable." It was an evident disregard of the Archbishop, and a sufficient indication of especial favour towards the man whom he had persecuted, but whose life was a practical demonstration of the truth, that integrity and virtue will eventually triumph over falsehood and reproach [1].

[1] At the birth of Charles, the Puritan faction partook not of the general joy. The ringleaders were zealously affected to-

But while Laud was thus diligently discharging his important duties, the fatal predestinarian controversy was again revived, notwithstanding the injunctions of the Church to bury that dogma in oblivion, and the recommendation to the clergy to confine themselves exclusively to the doctrines of Scripture. Dr. John Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, one of those who had been sent by King James to the Synod of Dort, and who had declared for universal redemption there, in a sermon preached before the Court during Lent, from Rom. vi. 23., discoursed on this subject, in open violation of the King's instructions to the Bishops. As it would

wards James' daughter, the Queen of Bohemia, and wished that the succession might end with Charles in her favour. At a public feast, held in Friday Street, London, one of their chiefs declared that "he could see no cause of rejoicing, because God had already better provided for them, in giving such a hopeful progeny to the Queen of Bohemia, brought up in the Reformed Religion, while it was uncertain what religion the King's children would follow, being to be brought up by a mother devoted to the Church of Rome." Dr. Heylin, who lived at the time, relates a fact in his own experience, which shews the disposition of the whole party. "I remember," says he, "being at a town in Gloucestershire, when the news came of the prince's birth. There was a great joy evinced by all the parish, in causing bonfires to be made, the bells to be rung, and sending victuals unto those of the younger sort, who were most busily employed in the public joy. But from the rest of the houses, being of the Presbyterian or Puritan faction, there came neither man, nor child, nor wood, nor victuals, their doors being shut all the evening, as in a time of general mourning and disconsolation."

have afforded matter of triumph to the Predestinarians, had Davenant been suffered to pass unnoticed, and the silence would either have been interpreted by them as a virtual acknowledgment of the tenet, or as inability to deny or refute it, the Bishop was summoned two days afterwards before the Privy Council. Harsnet, Archbishop of York, conducted the business against him. "Bishop Laud," says Fuller, "walking by all the while in silence, spake not one word." After some severe remarks by Harsnet, the Bishop, on proffering his submission and acknowledgment that he had misunderstood the King's Declaration, was dismissed[1]. This is another instance of the impartiality of the King and Laud, who did not wish the doctrine to be handled at all. Various others of lesser note were also called to account for their behaviour, and some of them prohibited to preach within the Diocese of London, unless they refrained from touching on a dogma which, as the King well remarked, was far above the comprehension of the people.

Laud's vigorous measures to preserve the peace and unity of the Church, amidst these religious distractions, had raised against him a number of enemies, who attacked him both from the pulpit and the press, who were privately suborned by their faction. The case of one of these, by far the most violent of the party, was now to occupy the atten-

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 138—141. Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 155, 156. 173, 174.

tion of the public, and as Laud has incurred the odium of his punishment, the case must be fairly and impartially stated.

During the sitting of the Parliament, Alexander Leighton, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, and a doctor of divinity, had published a volume, dedicated to the Puritan faction, which he dignified with the title of "An Appeal to the Parliament, or Zion's Plea against Prelacy;" and he had studiously stationed himself at the door of the House of Commons, and presented it to various of the members of the House, by the way of inflaming their zeal concerning the national turbulence. This man, whom Heylin deservedly calls a "fiery Puritan zealot[1]," and whom, says Fuller, in his usual facetious manner, "had he been an *Englishman*, we durst call him a *furious*, but now we will term him a *fiery* (whence kindled let others guess) member[2]," had endeavoured to excite tumult and rebellion, his book consisting of a "continual railing from beginning to end." His other book, entitled, "A Looking-Glass for the Holy War," was written in the same spirit.

This zealot was father to the famous Dr. Robert Leighton, successively Principal of the University of Edinburgh, Bishop of Dunblane, and Archbishop

[1] Heylin, p. 187.

[2] Fuller, ut sup. p. 136. He is termed by Rushworth, vol. iii. Append. p. 29, and by Whitelock, p. 15, *a Roman Catholic*. This is a mistake: for the rectifying of which, see Fuller, as quoted.

of Glasgow, a prelate who, though unquestionably pious and sincere, would not have received so much of the sectarian applause, had he been active and vigorous in the cause of the unfortunate and now too humble Church of which he was a dignitary. He was born at Edinburgh, in 1587, and imbibed largely that fanaticism and desire for spiritual novelties which Andrew Melville had imported from Geneva. He was educated at the College of King James VI. and University there, in which he became, it is said, Professor of Moral Philosophy. Towards the latter part of James' reign, he came to London, probably in the exercise of his profession, being also a Doctor of Physic; but nothing is known of him, nor would he, perhaps, have emerged from his obscurity, had he not excited public notoriety by his treasonable book. So dangerous was it in that factious age, and so violent were some of the expressions, that when the information was laid against him in the Star-Chamber, on the 4th of June 1630, the two Chief Justices gave it as their opinion, that "if the case had come before them, they would have proceeded against him for treason," and some of the Lords declared, that "it was from his Majesty's great mercy and goodness that he was brought to receive the sentence of that Court, and not arraigned as a traitor at another bar." That the book was intended to bear against Laud and the Lord Treasurer Weston, is unquestionable; for it appeared at the very time when the popular odium was excited against them, when the two

libellous threats were found in the Dean of St. Paul's yard; nor is it at all improbable that Leighton knew who were the writers. In "Zion's Plea," as he impiously termed it, this enthusiast libelled the King, Peers, and Bishops; he says, that "we do not read of greater persecution and higher indignity done upon God's people, in any nation professing the gospel, than in this our island, especially since the death of Queen Elizabeth;" he terms the prelates "men of blood, enemies to God and the state," and that their establishment and maintenance within this realm is a "snare and master-sin established by law." He declared the Church "to be Antichristian and Satanical," the Bishops "ravens and magpies that prey upon the state." The canons of the Church are termed by this fanatical dabbler, "nonsense canons." He abused the act of kneeling at the Communion, declaring that the Bishops "brought forth that received spawn of the Beast, kneeling at the sacrament." The Queen he styled "a Canaanite, a daughter of hell, an idolatress." He commended the murder of the Duke of Buckingham, and advised others to do the like. In every page he abused the King and Queen, the Government and the Constitution: he incites the rabble to smite the Bishops under the fifth rib; he quotes passages from the Jewish Scriptures to strengthen his advice; and then, by a crafty device, he thought to escape the censure of the King, by throwing all the odium on his advisers [1].

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. Part 2. p. 55, 56. and vol. iii. App. p. 29.

Leighton did not deny that he wrote the book, but he maintained that he did it from no ill design, and that his design was merely to draw the attention of Parliament to the national grievances, and thereby induce them to adopt such measures as might tend to the welfare of the Church and State, and the honour of the King. This lame defence was, in effect, a justification of his printed assertions, otherwise he must have thought that his judges were destitute of common sense. He was accordingly sentenced to be imprisoned in the Fleet Prison during his life, and to pay a fine of £10,000 to the King. He was then, in respect to his ecclesiastical functions, referred to the High Commission, because the other Court could not inflict any corporal punishment on persons while in holy orders; where being degraded from his ministry, he was brought back, and sentenced to be placed in the pillory at Westminster during the sitting of the Court, and there whipped: after his whipping to have one of his ears cut off, his nose slit, his forehead branded with S. S. for *seditious slanderer,* and then conducted to prison. At another time, he was to be placed in the pillory at Cheapside, his other ear cut off, again whipped, and then conducted to prison, till his Majesty should be pleased to set him at liberty.

Such was the sentence passed against this unfortunate man, and it must be admitted that it was severe; that it excites the shudder of humanity; and that the punishment of this man, who was a fitter inmate for a madhouse than a prison, far exceeded his offence. It is not my intention to ani-

madvert on this sentence, only severe with respect to the cutting off the ears, the slitting of the nose, and the branding of the forehead, which, however, were the modes of punishment in that age; but yet it was not without aggravation. Even Neal, the champion of Puritanism, says that he was guilty of "very great rudeness and indecency;" and declares that "the warmth of his expressions is not to be justified." It is my object to investigate how far it is chargeable on Laud, or if he had any concern in it at all; though I must here observe, that circumstances must be taken into account, which will at least palliate the sentence, and the conduct of Leighton's judges. The man who willingly and deliberately publishes sedition to the world, and excites his fellow-subjects to rebellion and blood, is a much greater criminal than another man, who may have given utterance to such sentiments in the momentary excitement of passion. On this same principle, the man who advises to commit murder, as Leighton did, is hardly less criminal than the man who follows his advice. In times of peace and moderation, such guilty recommendations have no effect, because the people are inclined to reason calmly on the subject, and, therefore, a timely interference of the Government, and a punishment proportionable to the evil which is likely to arise from the state of the public mind, are all that are requisite. Hence, in the present day the fanatic who could utter such sentiments would not merit the severity of punishment necessary in the reign of Charles I., because enthusiasm is

restrained, and the laws can be put in speedy operation. But the man who, in an age of fermentation and religious extravagance, instead of acting the part of a good subject, and endeavouring to allay those unhappy commotions, still farther excites the wanderings of that daring spirit which runs to fearful extremes; who reviles the Government before he has proved it to be bad, merely because he and his faction think it so; who can write with all the fierceness of hate and individual prejudice against religious institutions, which, their divine authority apart, had as conscientious supporters as, peradventure, they might have had opposers; who abuses his sovereign, and holds up to ridicule the members of the royal House; who condemns the royal measures because his party opposes them; who can coolly commend a deliberate murder, and advise others to re-act the like tragedy, and who addresses himself to factious men, already phrenzied by religious fanaticism; who, in short, a Christian minister, adventuring into the arena of politics without any necessity, inculcates, under a puritanical form, the most daring treason and rebellion;—such a man is deserving of no slight punishment, as being a public enemy, an incendiary in the State, whose freedom is dangerous, and of whom an example ought to be made. I do not vindicate the sentence, much less do I either affirm or deny that Leighton's punishment was commensurate with the offence; but I hold, that if he was insane, his insanity under any circumstances was dangerous; if not, who will hesitate to

say that he was not a rebel, and consequently a traitor to his sovereign? Every man, at his birth, gives a tacit consent to the established government, nor is he bound to seek redress even for grievances, except at the instance of the laws, or from the public representatives of the nation, if these act according to the constitution. But he who takes upon himself, as an individual, the office of judge, and advises, through the medium of the press, to measures of violence, is entitled to the same ceremony he has employed, as to the punishment he deserves. And had Leighton's book passed unnoticed, or its author unpunished, the Government, and not he, would have been highly culpable.

It may be doubted, whether the sentence was intended to be executed on this unfortunate man, for, though it was given towards the end of Trinity Term, yet five months were suffered to elapse, in order to give some opportunity to the offender for penitence: it was not till the 4th of November that Leighton was actually degraded. Rushworth indeed asserts, that "it required some time in the ecclesiastical court, in order to the degradation of the defendant;" but this formality was utterly gratuitous, for Leighton was not ordained by the English Church, but was of presbyterian ordination, and, therefore, could not be expected to derive any favour from the Church of which he was not a member. This proceeding, however, might have been instituted in order to give him the benefit of delay, that he might tender his submission, while,

at the same time, it deprived him of entertaining the notion that the sentence could not be immediately enforced. But penitence was no feature of Leighton's party. On Wednesday, the 10th, being a court day, he was to have undergone the sentence, but on the previous night he effected, by some means or other, with the contrivance of his friends, his escape. A proclamation was issued to apprehend him, and he was taken in Bedfordshire, within two weeks, and returned to the Fleet. On the 16th of November, the first part of the cruel sentence was carried into effect before the New Palace at Westminster, and he suffered it to the full extent, with the exception of the fine and the imprisonment for life, being released after an imprisonment of ten years by the Long Parliament, in 1640. As a remuneration for his sufferings, he was made Keeper of Lambeth Palace, at that time converted into a prison, and he died insane in 1644-5.

Such were the severe sufferings of the unfortunate Leighton, a man of considerable learning and abilities, and otherwise worthy of the University where he was educated, but whose "untempered zeal, as his countrymen gave it out," says Rushworth, "prompted him to that mistake for which the *necessity of affairs at that time required this severity from the hand of the magistrate*, more, perhaps, than the crime would do in a following juncture." This is a remarkable admission from an author who has been charged with being partial to

the Puritans. Laud's concern in the punishment of this individual now claims investigation, more especially as this is one of the cases which his enemies adduce to establish his cruelty.

And here it is lamentable to find not only a clergyman of that Church, but a graduate of that University, of which Laud was the ornament, and for his attachment to which he at last died a martyr, uniting with the sectarian testimonies to criminate this great prelate. Dr. Charles Symmons, of Jesus College, Oxford, in his Life of Milton[1], after informing us, that he dislikes "the principles and the temper of the unfortunate Laud," and yet endeavouring to account for his political conduct from the "effects of education, *or from the natural and of course venal corruption of office in its influence on the understanding and the heart*," and for his "bigotted observance of ceremonies" from "the example of some of his most eminent predecessors," and which at any other period "would have been an innocent if not an inoffensive display of *littleness*;" thus, in the same style of affected liberality, proceeds, "But when I see him confounding the cause of Christ with that of the prelate, when I observe him persecuting with merciless rigour men of exemplary lives, united with him in *every point* of Christian faith, and whose sole crime was a *conscientious* opposition to the

[1] Life of John Milton, by Charles Symmons, D.D. of Jesus College, Oxford. Second edit. p. 219—221.

hierarchical dignity, and a regard to what they deemed to be the simplicity of the gospel; when I contemplate him on the judgment-seat[1], uncovering his head, and thanking God on the passing of a cruel sentence, WHICH HE HIMSELF HAD DICTATED; when I see him afterwards in his closet, recording, with calm rancour and cold-blooded exultation, the execution of these judicial barbarities; when I behold him *insulting the age* of the mild and liberal Abbot, and spurning him from his throne to obtain premature possession of the metropolitan power; when I remark him ruining with vengeance, as ungrateful as it was unrelenting, *the first patron of his fortunes,* Bishop Williams, *whose hand had placed the mitre on his head,* my charity must necessarily falter, and I cannot immediately decide that he stands accountable for nothing more than erroneous judgment. By that prelate's conduct his party was covered with odium, and it was detested BY THE WISE, who foresaw its approaching ruin, and by the moderate, who were disgusted with its tyranny."

These are the sentiments of Dr. Symmons, a minister of the Church of England, which he improves by informing us, that the " Puritans might

[1] He refers in the note to Leighton's case, " When an inhuman sentence was passed upon Dr. Leighton, Laud pulled off his cap in the court, and thanked God for it. The prelate noted in his Diary the execution of these butchering sentences of the Star-Chamber and High Council, with the cool malignity of a fiend."

have exulted over their prostrate persecutor, in nearly the same strains of triumph which Isaiah, in his twofold character of prophet and of poet, so nobly ascribes to the exiles of Israel on the fall of the king of Babylon. 'How hath the oppressor ceased! He who smote the people in wrath with a continual stroke; he that ruled the nations in anger is persecuted, and none hindereth,' &c."

Had Laud really been the man here represented by Dr. Symmons, had he really pursued a course so criminal and guilty, I know no language which could have been too severe to express his infamy and disgrace. But, if it be true that this is not the case, if it can be proved that this is the language of enthusiasm and false representation, I greatly fear that it may be turned against his accuser, who in *his* closet has betrayed a bigotry and a malignity worse than what he charges on Laud, when recording the "barbarities" of the Star-Chamber. It is exceedingly unfair to assert that the notification of the passing events of the day in a private journal, is a complete proof of a man's badness of heart,—it is ridiculous to take such a journal, which does not contain a single comment on the times, and draw inferences from it on a man's talent and capacity, as Mr. Hallam has done in his Constitutional History; and it denotes a species of malignity of no common order, to charge a man with having been personally concerned in every thing which he has privately recorded. But for such a man as Dr. Symmons to charge Laud with

weakness; for *him,* a member of the Church of England, to say that Laud's party was deserted *by the wise;* for him to say that the "sole crime" of the Puritans was a "*conscientious* opposition to the hierarchy;" for him to aver, that because a man is in "office" he must necessarily become "venal and corrupt," appears to me to be most singular and unaccountable. Was that *weakness,* or *littleness,* which induced this truly noble prelate to continue, through life, the unwearied benefactor of his University, the patron of learning and religion? And every time that this writer walked through the streets of that venerable seat of learning, did he not behold the monuments of Laud's munificence when St. John's College met his eye, or when his princely benefactions to the Library came under his notice? Had other writers, and those who think with him in the Church, lived in those days of peril, it cannot be doubted that they would have been among those *wise* and *moderate,* who would rather become time-servers to the enemy, than defend to the utmost our venerable ecclesiastical establishment. And miserably ignorant must he be of mankind, and a gloomy misanthrope must he be in principle, who can be so absurd as to assert, that political conduct which is not approved by the mob, must arise either from the effects of education, or "from the *natural,* and, of course, venal corruption of office on the heart and understanding." The man ought to blush who can vindicate these sentiments, not only because they are

false, but even if they were probable, they are not established; since not a solitary instance is on record to prove Laud guilty of venality and corruption, or of enriching himself at the expence of his country: and since, to make out a case, it is necessary to substantiate an inclination to bribery and subserviency, with which he has never been charged even by his most virulent enemies.

It is dastardly and base in the extreme to disturb the ashes of the illustrious dead, and to cover with obloquy the memory of a man who, by his munificence and generosity, atoned for a thousand imperfections. It is clear, however, that in all this disgusting affectation of liberality there is greater bigotry than in any case of what is termed high-church intolerance,—the same dislike to principles characterizes each, with this difference, that the "*mild and liberal low-churchman*" scowls bitterly on those who oppose him, and takes every opportunity to calumniate and traduce, under the convenient garb of affected piety and zeal. I have already proved that the "sole crimes of the Puritan faction," whom this writer extols at the expence of the Church, whose sacred orders he had received, were something more than "a conscientious opposition to the hierarchy,"—that Laud at no time insulted "the age of the mild and liberal Abbot, to obtain premature possession of his power,"—and it is distinctly denied that Williams was "the patron of Laud's fortunes," or aided to place the mitre on his brow, except to preserve for himself

the Deanery of Westminster, which otherwise Laud would have obtained. The reader need not be reminded of Abbot's cruel persecution of Laud, of the opposition which the latter invariably experienced—of the contemptuous insults which the high-churchman Laud, received from the "mild and liberal" low-churchman Abbot, when he went to procure his sanction for a scheme he had proposed to improve the condition of the poor clergy, and which Bishop Williams himself had pronounced to be the "best office done for the Church these seven years"—so "mild and liberal," truly that virtue became vice in any act in which Laud was concerned[1]: nor need he be reminded of Williams' craftiness in sending Laud to St. David's, that his own self-interest might be gratified. And if Dr. Symmons chose to insert in a note, that the "good bishop" Williams would not proceed against the Puritans, because he knew that they would finally prevail, which is a lamentable display of selfishness on Williams' part, he ought not to have neglected to inform his readers, seeing that he has referred to the very passage in Rushworth, which states that Williams was then in disgrace; and that he added as his reason, that "*he had no hope of another bishopric*."—"Whatever," says the learned Henry Wharton, "may be in this matter against Dr. Laud, I am sure no art or colour can defend that bitter revenge of Archbishop Williams, which

[1] Diary, p. 11.

prompted him to move, earnestly, in the House of Lords, that the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, then a prisoner in the Tower, might be sequestrated, and put into the hands of his inferior officers, which by his importunity he obtained, to the great prejudice of the Church, and no small infamy of himself [1]."

To assert that Laud persecuted men who were united with him in *every point* of Christian faith, is, to say the least, an evidence of very superficial knowledge, as no opinions can be more opposite than those of the liberal man who believes that salvation is within the reach of every human being to whom it is preached, if he choose to accept it; and those of the gloomy Calvinist, who plunges into the secret things of God, presumptuously brings forward his dogma of predestination, and sets limits to the grace of God, which God himself never set. In this instance, Dr. Symmons' *bigotry* and *littleness* are farther evident. Nor is his assertion, that "the Prelate noted in his Diary the execution of the butchering sentences of the Star-Chamber and High Commission with the cool malignity of a fiend," in any respect more veracious. From this a reader would infer, that there are many such sentences recorded, whereas Leighton's is the solitary instance: even the sentence of Burton, Prynne, and Bastwick, in 1637, in many respects merited, which the frenzied authors of the History of

[1] Wharton's Preface to the Diary, p. iii.

Dissenters designate "a most infamous tragedy," is not recorded by Laud, though he delivered a speech on the occasion. And I greatly fear that Dr. Symmons' bigotry and inveterate prejudice precluded him from perusing the Diary, or the account of any of those transactions in which Laud was concerned. Ignorance is indeed in some measure an excuse; but if the above sentiments were written after such a perusal, the writer is unpardonable.

With respect to Leighton's case, there is not the slightest evidence that Laud was present at the trial. In all the accounts of the Star-Chamber which I have been able to examine, I do not find him mentioned in this case. Archdeacon Echard informs us, that "though the nature of the crime, the obstinacy of the offender, and the necessity of suppressing such a furious spirit, sufficiently required this or the like punishment, yet it had the natural effect of moving pity in the people, and of raising new prejudices against the court and government." But if this sentence had been of Laud's dictation, as Symmons asserts, and in this *he* goes farther than Neal or Messrs. Bogue and Bennet; had he actually "pulled off his cap in the court, and thanked God for it," is it at all probable that these facts could have been concealed from the people, and would they not gladly have caught at them, to renew their clamours against a man whom their factious leaders hated, and whose life had a few days before been threatened? Yet not one of

the writers of that age, in opposition to Laud, Peirce excepted, asserts that in this he had any concern, nor has he ever been upbraided for the fact, except by the enthusiasts of modern times; it being thought more likely, according to modern *liberality*, that a prelate, who was a minister of state in a turbulent age, should be venal, cruel, and corrupt, than that a faction, whose intentions were blood, whose religion was enthusiasm, and in the leaders hypocrisy, should be in the slightest degree doubted as to their "conscientious opposition to the hierarchical dignity."

Denying, therefore, that there is any evidence that Laud was present at the trial of Leighton, what remains as to the fact of his noting Leighton's censure in his Diary? Does that amount to a proof that he was actually present? Assuredly not. He records many things in that private journal in which he had no concern; for instance, on the 1st of May, 1625, he has recorded the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria at Paris, which excited the clamour of the Puritan faction, and additional enmity towards the unfortunate Buckingham; and yet Laud, besides having no concern in the treaty, was not at that time in Paris, but in London. Again, he has recorded the dissolution of the first Parliament at Oxford for not complying with the King's measures, and yet he was confined in his lodgings at St. John's College. The mere notification of any fact in the Diary is no proof at all that he was present at its occurrence

I now examine the authorities on which this calumny against Laud rests. In his Diary, he has simply noted the facts thus: "November 4, Thursday, Leighton was degraded at the High Commission. Nov. 9, Tuesday, that night Leighton broke out of the Fleet. The warden says, he got or was helped over the wall: the warden professes he knew it not then till Wednesday noon. He told it not to me till Thursday night. He was taken again in Bedfordshire, and brought back within a fortnight to the Fleet. Nov. 26, Friday, part of his sentence was executed upon him at Westminster." This is all which is said on the subject; and even Prynne, who has altered and mutilated the Diary, has really had the honesty not to make any alteration, though in numerous other instances he has inserted or omitted passages to suit his convenience. Keeping, therefore, Laud's own *authentic* record in view, let us see how it has been distorted by certain writers. Dr. Charles Symmons has already "contemplated Laud on the judgment-seat, uncovering his head, and thanking God on the passing of a cruel sentence, *which he himself* had dictated," and afterwards this same Dr. Symmons, by a wonderful transition, saw him "in his closet recording, with calm rancour and cold-blooded exultation, the execution of these judicial barbarities;" that is, *he* imagined this *dictated* sentence, and *thought* he saw the prelate in his closet; and then he actually refers to the above passage from the Diary, where he says the prelate has recorded the

sentence "with the cool malignity of a fiend;" whereas, if we could not ascertain from other sources than Laud's Diary what that sentence was, Dr. Symmons, fertile as he was in imagination, would have conjectured a considerable time. So much, then, for the authenticity of this writer's narrative, who has chosen to take the authority of the Puritans, and embellish the tale accordingly. Neal, the great oracle, in the same spirit, after relating the falsehood that Laud pulled off his cap and gave thanks to God, thus proceeds: "On Friday, Nov. 6, part of the sentence was executed upon him, *(says Bishop Laud, in his Diary,)* after this manner: 1. He was severely whipt before he was put in the pillory. 2. Being set in the pilory, he had one of his ears cut off," &c. *But not a single word of all this description is to be found in the Diary.* A reference is made by Neal, in the margin, to Priestworth's Collections, and, strange to say, unluckily for Puritan veracity, not a single word of this story is to be found in Priestworth. He refers, moreover, to Pierce's History of the Dissenters, but here, though he is more at home, he is again unfortunate. Pierce's authority was the regicide Edmund Ludlow, that noted republican fanatic, who voted the House of Peers dangerous; whom Cromwell himself was forced to place under restraint, and for whose apprehension a large reward was offered at the Restoration. It is set forth in his Memoirs, published in 1698. Let us now take Messrs. Bogue and Bennet's account. After re-

peating the Puritan tale of Laud pulling off his cap, they have the assurance to observe, "That we may justly appreciate his Lordship's devotion, he has recorded in his Diary, the sentence which raised his gratitude to heaven! his ears were cut off," (our authors proceed, *as if quoting from the Diary,)* "his nose slit, his face branded with burning irons; he was tied to a post, and whipped with a treble cord, of which every lash brought away the flesh. He was kept in the pillory near two hours, in frost and snow."

It will scarcely be credited that the language of any man should be so distorted and falsely represented by writers who pledge themselves to the public that they relate facts as they find them; but still less will it be credited, that any writer could have the boldness to refer to a document, wherein he is conscious that no such language is to be found as he sets forth. Such, however, is the fact; so that we have here three modern writers, the oracles of their different parties, whose want of candour is most palpable and glaring. But there is still better evidence that Laud had no connexion with Leighton's sentence, and that it was *not* of his dictation, from one very important circumstance. At his trial there was no charge made against him on this subject, and yet every transaction, even the most trivial, of his whole life, was on that occasion remembered, and magnified into a crime. Prynne, the most virulent of all his enemies, who was the principal conductor of the prosecution, who had

himself, with Burton and Bartwick, been served in the same manner, entirely omits it; and at a trial where there was such a lack of facts to make out a case, it is not to be supposed that this, a material one, would have been forgotten, more especially as the revival of it would the more inflame the public mind. Leighton himself was alive at the time; he was then residing in Lambeth Palace, in the capacity of a jailor, that venerable edifice having been converted into a prison by the republicans, and from him every information could have been procured. Prynne was not likely to have neglected this circumstance, as he saw Leighton daily, and the affair was too recent to have escaped Leighton's memory, if the sentence inflicted on him had been of Laud's own dictation. It is asked, then, Why was it not produced as evidence against Laud? It may be replied, there were sufficient charges without it: but this is not the fact; and it is therefore asked again, Whether the repairing of St. Paul's cathedral and the consecration of a church, or the depriving Leighton of his ears and the slitting of his nose for writing a book which the Puritans highly commended, was more worthy of investigation on their part. Yet the two former were actually imputed to him as crimes [1], while the latter, which so much favoured and gratified the Puritan faction, was forgotten. And Prynne, Laud's arch-enemy, who was conspicuous during that age of turbulence for his opposition, who ran-

[1] Hist. of Troubles and Trials, p. 339, 340. Heylin, p. 204. 208. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 76, 77. 410. 462. 719.

sacked all his papers, mutilated, destroyed, and inserted what he pleased; who continually abused him for his alleged cruelty, tyranny, and oppression, has not in any of his productions, neither in the "Hidden Works of Darkness brought to Light," "Canterburie's Doom," nor any of his minor effusions, made a single reference to the affair. When Prynne was punished, though Laud on that occasion acted in no other capacity than as a member of the Court, he was unjustly charged with the whole procedure[1]; yet here is a case exactly parallel, in which Laud is not mentioned at all. It is evident, therefore, from the above facts, viz. that no mention is made of Laud's presence at this trial; that the writers who have testified against Laud, have been proved to be guilty of distorting and misrepresenting language, and of making false assertions; that, though Leighton's sentence excited the public commiseration, nothing was said against Laud at the time, who was then so unpopular as to have had his life threatened, and the rabble were by no means ignorant of the Star-Chamber proceedings; that though Leighton himself was alive at the time of Laud's trial, and survived him, and though he was then in Laud's own palace, he neither charged the prelate with dictating the sentence, nor was applied to in proof; that it was entirely omitted at the trial, while at the same time his enemies were so miserably pushed for articles of

[1] Prynne's New Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny, 4to. 1641.

impeachment, that one of his alleged crimes was that of repairing St. Paul's, and another, and, indeed, the great one, that of being what they termed an Arminian; and that Prynne, his chief opposer, who had himself undergone the same sentence, and who otherwise raked together every thing which he could against the prelate, takes not the slightest notice of it;—it is evident, I maintain, and undeniable, that Laud has been most unjustly reproached for this affair, with which he had not the least concern, either as a judge, or as a member of the Star-Chamber.

The prolixity of these remarks, and the interruption of the history, will be pardoned, since it is my duty to lay the actions of this calumniated prelate fairly and impartially before the reader. Having, therefore, proved that Laud has been unjustly reproached for this transaction, I proceed to follow him in his other important concerns. On Sunday, the 16th of January 1630-1, we find him consecrating the church of St. Catharine Cree, London, and on the Sunday after, the church of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, with all the solemnity which that solemn and ancient service requires. This important duty, for which so many analogies are found in the history of the Jewish, and so many precedents in that of the primitive Christian Church, of publicly consecrating and setting apart edifices for divine worship, was regarded by Laud with pious care, and we find him, in various parts of his life, sedulously watchful and minute in its observance. In opposi-

tion to the notions of the sectarian, whose conventicle was devoted one day to the worship of his Maker, according to the manner in which he thought proper to conduct it, and the next day might be turned into a place for the exhibition of worldly and even sensual gratifications—at least adapted for any purposes whether religious or worldly, it was the conviction of Laud, as it had been of the Church in all ages, that in buildings which were reared for the specific design of becoming Christian temples, a certain form should be observed to mark the object of their erection, and to distinguish between sacred and profane foundations. He did not require to be told that the presence of God was not confined to temples made with hands; but man, while in this state of imperfection, subject to human passions and infirmities, must be impressed by outward objects, the source whence he derives his mental knowledge. Religion, indeed, is addressed neither to the senses nor to the imagination, but to the heart, and man is required to exercise his reasoning faculties upon it, to understand its doctrines, so far as his nature is capable, and to practise its sacred injunctions. Nevertheless, an affected spirituality is by no means a criterion of purity, nor a total divestment of ceremonies a safeguard against the introduction of error. The man who is an advocate for rude simplicity, and for a form which he calls spiritual, fit only for philosophers, and who revels at will amid the wild and visionary speculations of a heated imagination, is

liable to fanaticism, and to opinions as dangerous as the notions of the Popish devotee, who reckons the ceremonial of the mass of no avail, if his priest commit the slightest blunder in its celebration, and who conceives that no prayers are acceptable to Heaven, unless he prefaces them in his devotions by the sign of the cross. Both are evidently mistaken, and both have totally misconceived the nature of man in this state of imperfection. Ceremonies, so far as their mere mechanism or nature is concerned, are not necessary to salvation, nor is an excess of ceremonies at all desirable, as thereby religion becomes burdensome in its observances; but they may be, and they are, the means of impressing the mind with devotional feelings, and of fostering that regard for religion, which, even when grounded on superstition, is a thousand times more beneficial than the violent extravagancies of fanaticism, too often mistaken for genuine religion by the advocates and the devotees of spirituality.

I confess that the investigation of this part of Bishop Laud's life is a task of extreme difficulty and delicacy, both from the odium which he has received from his attention to forms and observances, and from the circumstances in which any individual is placed who reasons on them in an age like the present. But in maintaining that the Papists and the Puritans were alike in their notions of ceremonies, I conceive that I assert a remarkable fact, however paradoxical it may appear; for if the Papists made a merit of their ceremonies, the Puritans

also made a merit, as they conceived, of observing none. Here, then, was a collision of two extremes; the one devotee imagining that he made himself acceptable to Heaven by many and varied acts of outward devotion, and the other that he did so by rejecting them altogether, and clamouring for what he called the worship of the spirit. The error of the Papists consisted, as it does yet, in believing too much, in other words, taking too much for granted, without due investigation, on the authority of others; the error of the Puritans in believing too little, that is in rejecting altogether every human authority, and trusting solely to the vapourings of their enthusiastic minds. If the Papist groaned from bodily mortifications, and placed his salvation on the dicta of his priest; the Puritan groaned in spirit, and reckoned the value of his services, not in the substance, but in the length of time during which he was occupied. His spiritual mortifications, therefore, by listening for hours to the declamations of his teacher, were as severe as the bodily penances of the Papist, and both placed merit on their performances, with this difference—that the Papist performed an act of the body, the Puritan of the mind. If the one was superstitious, the other was unquestionably enthusiastic; and it is my conviction that, supposing for a moment there was any merit in these observances, the Puritan would gain heaven more easily than the Papist; for nothing is more evident than that man is more naturally inclined to gratify his prejudices, and to land at last in the

marsh of fanaticism, than to subject himself to bodily mortifications, which are frequently severe, and in some cases intolerable.

To maintain that ceremonial observances in the Christian Church are matters of expediency, as some writers have done, appears to me a species of sophistry which ought to be now laid aside: for though, in certain cases, the argument may generally hold, yet it is open to serious objections, and, therefore, I maintain, that ceremonies without the authority of the Holy Catholic Church, as sanctioned by the primitive Christians, though sometimes they may be expedient, are of little general utility. Nor do I believe that the primitive Fathers degraded themselves so far as to submit to the heathen prejudices of the vulgar in their age, and thus blend together the objects of faith and sense, the rites of Christianity with those of Paganism, that they might allure converts to the Christian Church. The ceremonies which the Church of England enjoins are those of the apostolic age, and I believe, for my own part, were practised by the Apostles themselves, who had more correct ideas on form and order than the self-styled evangelists of modern times. The accommodation of religious worship to national customs, for the purpose of extending Christianity, is a feature of Popery, which has thereby the most convenient ritual and policy of any religious communion, and Gregory afforded a specimen of this in his remarkable instructions concerning the conversion of the English. In like manner, the Romish

missionaries act at the present day, who, for their part, would not scruple to blend the ritual of Confucius or Brahma with that of Christ, with a convenient share of the religion, too, if by that means they could extend the nominal jurisdiction of his Holiness. Nevertheless I agree with Mr. Hume on this subject, (whose sincerity it is not my province here to discuss,) even in the matter of expediency. "Whatever ridicule, to a philosophical mind, may be thrown on pious ceremonies, it must be confessed, that during a very religious age, no institutions can be more advantageous to the rude multitude, and tend more to mollify that fierce and gloomy spirit of devotion to which they are subjected. Even the English Church, though it had retained a share of Popish ceremonies, may justly be thought too naked and unadorned, and still to approach too near the abstract and spiritual religion of the Puritans. Laud and his associates, by reviving a few primitive institutions of this nature, corrected the error of the first reformers, and presented to the affrightened and astonished mind some sensible exterior observances, which might occupy it during its religious exercises, and abate the violence of its disappointed efforts [1]."

An opportunity will again occur of fully discussing this very important subject. In Laud's scrupulous attention to this part of religious duty, for which his mistaken enemies honoured him with the

[1] Hume's History of England, vol. vii. 8vo. London, 1788, p. 41, 42.

title of *Master of Ceremonies*, he was actuated by the best motives, by the example of the primitive Christians, by the analogy of the Jewish Church, by his respect for antiquity, and his anxiety at once to separate the Church from the extravagances of Puritan enthusiasm. The consecration of St. Catherine Cree was imputed to him as one of his crimes, but it must be observed that he vindicated himself from the aspersions of his calumniators. The account of it, as given by Rushworth, Hume, and Neal[1], was denied by the Bishop, and with every appearance of truth. It is reported by these writers, that Laud went both to St. Catherine Cree and St. Giles' with a great company, and proceeding to the west door, he exclaimed, "Open, ye everlasting doors," &c.: and having entered, he knelt down, and exclaimed, "This place is holy, the ground is holy, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy." But, as Laud himself remarked, there is a derivative and a relative holiness both in places and in vessels, nor ought either of these set apart for divine worship to be adapted at will to common purposes. No notion is more absurd than that of certain religionists, who conceive that a building is no longer a church, than when the congregation is assembled within its walls. What is this but asserting, that persons do actually communicate virtue to the

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 71—74. Hume, ut sup. vol. vi. Neal, vol. ii. p. 219—222.

sanctuary? and if so, it must be followed up according to their various characters: for if there be a congregation of avowed sinners, then there is no church; and if they be saints, they, it would appear, carry this holiness with them when they depart. But consecration is a solemn and a primitive service; it tends to promote the spirit of reverence and devotion; it teaches us to look with respect on the Christian temple, because we know that the Almighty has in a special manner declared that he will be present in the public assemblies of his people: our Saviour himself set us an example, by honouring a Feast of Dedication with his presence[1], which was undeniably an anniversary of the Dedication celebrated by Ezra[2]: and that religious philosophy is worthy of contempt which can talk with disdain of those duties practised by the Church in all ages. More especially was a due regard to the edifices of devotion necessary in that age, when the negligence of Abbot had permitted them either to fall into decay, or to be prostituted to every ignoble purpose, to become, in fact, in too many instances, mere conventicles, where the prejudices were gratified at the expence of religious instruction. Religion is a serious concern, and he who spurns at the edifices erected for the celebration of its services is little under its genuine influence. On the same principle, those enthusiasts who attend its public ministrations, hunting after the novelties of human eloquence,

[1] St. John x. 22. [2] Ezra vi. 16, 17.

and forgetting the specific purposes of all religious homage, praise, prayer, and the reading of the canon of inspiration, give sufficient indications that their religious philosophy is the result of obstinacy, and of a fondness for their own peculiar forms and fancies, which places them on the same level with the Romish devotee.

With these transactions ended the year 1630, as connected with Laud: and it is now necessary to notice the magnificent projects which our great prelate formed this year, and which sufficiently denote his munificent and generous spirit. These were found written, with his own hand, on the last leaf of his Diary, "at what time, or what year," says the learned Wharton, "is uncertain;" but Rushworth places them in 1630, which appears to be the case, from his noticing the impropriations and the repairs of St. Paul's, in which he was engaged the next year. No less than twenty-three are enumerated by him, which are the following.

The first is blotted out, and, therefore, it is impossible to conjecture its nature. "2. To build at St. John's, in Oxford, where I was educated, for the good and safety of that College. 3. To overthrow the feoffments, dangerous both to Church and State, going under the specious pretence of buying in impropriations. 4. To procure from King Charles all the impropriations yet remaining in the crown, within the realm of Ireland, for that poor Church. 5. To set upon the repair of St. Paul's Church in London. 6. To collect and perfect the

broken, crossing, and imperfect statutes of the University of Oxford, which had lain in a confused heap some hundreds of years. 7. *Blotted out.* 8. To settle the statutes of all the Cathedral Churches of the new foundations, whose statutes are imperfect, and not confirmed. 9. To annex for ever some settled commendams, and those, if it may be, *sine cura*, to all the small bishoprics. 10. To find a way to increase the stipends of poor vicars. 11. To see the tithes of London settled between the clergy and the city. 12. To set up a Greek press in London and Oxford, for printing of the Library MSS. and to get both letters (types) and matrices. 13. To settle 80*l.* a year, for ever, out of Dr. Fryar's lands, (after the death of Dr. John Fryar, the son,) upon the brick of St. Paul's, to the repair, till that be finished, and to keep it in good condition afterwards. 14. To procure a large charter for Oxford, to confirm the ancient privileges, and obtain new for them, as large as those of Cambridge, which they had gotten since Henry VIII.'s reign, and which Oxford had not. 15. To open the great square at Oxford, between St. Mary's and the schools, Brazen-nose and All Souls. 16. To settle an Hospital of land in Reading, of 100*l.* per annum, in a new way. 17. To erect an Arabic lecture at Oxford, at least for my life-time, my estate not being sufficent for any longer period. 18. To settle the impropriation of the vicarage of Cudsden on the Bishop of Oxford. 19. To get a book in vellum fairly written, containing the Records which

are in the Tower, and which concern the clergy. 20. To procure a new charter for the College of Dublin from his Majesty, and a body of new statutes made, to rectify that government, and a mortmain. 21. A charter for the town of Reading. 22. If I live to see the repair of St. Paul's near an end, to move his Majesty for the like grant from the High Commission, for the bringing in of impropriations, and then I hope to buy two in a year at least. 23. To procure for St. John's College, in Oxford, the perpetual inheritance and patronage of St. Lawrence, Reading[1]."

Such were the "things which," says Laud, "I have projected to do, if God bless me in them;" and it will be subsequently shewn how far he was able to carry them into effect. They require no comment, and the very mention of those magnificent plans is conclusive as to his noble integrity, his care for religion, learning, and piety. Much as he regarded his own University, his benefactions were not exclusive, and Ireland equally experienced his generous care. His mind disdained every appearance of self-aggrandizement, and he was resolved to spend his episcopal revenues in benefiting his country. The monuments of his munificence still remain, proofs of his unwearied industry, activity, and perseverance; but what other things his enlarged mind might have projected, it is impos-

[1] Diary, p. 68, 69. Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 74, 75.

sible to say: it is enough to know the melancholy fact, that, to adopt the expression of the Church Historian, "one stroke of the cruel axe spoiled the work of many hammers."

CHAPTER XII.

1631—1633.

The Impropriations—Conduct of Laud—Dr. Peter Heylin's Sermon at St. Mary's, Oxford—Laud restrains the Impropriations—His proceedings at Oxford—He enlarges St. John's College—Promotes the repairs of St. Paul's Cathedral—Clamours of the Puritans—His government of the University—Enforces the statutes—Remarkable Enthusiasm of a graduate—Combination of the Puritan faction at Oxford—Cognizance of three of the leaders—Their punishments—Impartiality of Laud—New revival of the Predestinarian Controversy—Archbishop Usher of Ireland—Calumnies against Laud—Lord Wentworth proceeds to Ireland—Ecclesiastical affairs—Prosecution of the King's printers—Henry Sherfield—William Prynne—Notice of him and his writings—His seditious libels—His imprisonment—Proceedings relative to chaplains and foreign service—The English congregation at Hamburgh—Salutary regulations by Laud—General remarks.

In pursuance of the designs which Laud had formed for the advancement of learning and religion, we find him at this period engaged in the affair of the impropriations which had been purchased by that contrivance of the Puritan faction, the feoffments, for the support of lectureships. The feoffments for purchasing these impropriations had been projected in 1626, by one of the Puritan leaders, Dr. John Preston, of King's and Queen's Colleges, Cambridge, who managed their affairs. It was the design of

the faction to establish lectureships in the market towns, where there was a greater intercourse of people than in the country parts, and where they were always certain of adherents from among the idle and the wavering; and thus, by retaining the patronage in their own hands, they would be enabled to gratify their taste by what they called a preaching ministry. For this purpose they had erected themselves into a body corporate, though they had no sanction from the Government, consisting of twelve persons, viz. four ministers, four lawyers, and four citizens, who with their own and the money of others, were to purchase all the impropriations in the hands of laymen[1].

The design being formed under the appearance of piety and zeal for religion, succeeded to the utmost extent. "Here," says Fuller, "were four divines to persuade men's consciences, four lawyers to draw all conveyances, and four citizens, who commanded rich coffers, wanting nothing save some swordsmen to defend all the rest." This specious pretence of religious zeal operated on the people, and the self-elected corporation received immense sums from various parts of the country to support their seemingly pious intentions. Indeed, this contrivance of the Puritan faction was so dexterous and successful, that it was reported, that within half a century, they would not be able to find any more purchases of impropriations.

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 136.

But in the act sermon, preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, 1630, they were attacked by Dr. Heylin, then Fellow of Magdalen College, who having been at a town in Gloucestershire, where one of the lectureships had been established, had witnessed the craftiness and iniquity of the whole affair [1]. He preached from Matt. xiii. 25. "But while men slept, the enemy came, and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way;" and towards the end of his sermon he enlarged with great severity on the characters and designs of the feoffment corporation. Great was the indignation of the Puritan faction, who meditated revenge towards this enemy; and the clamour was so violent, that Heylin was compelled at last to send his discourse to Laud, and signify his willingness to defend his positions. Laud had already reported to the King on the subject, and his Majesty had declared that "he would not have the clergy fettered with lay dependencies [2];" and viewing the whole project as a design to undermine the Church and oppose the State, he caused

[1] Heylin, p. 198, 199. Wood's Athen. Oxon. by Bliss, vol. iii. col. 554. Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, p. 386. By the latter writer, Heylin is termed Laud's great minion, and he says that Laud "set on this prosecution with more edge, by suborning his flattering creatures to declaim against these feoffees, and their design in the pulpit, both at Court and elsewhere." But Prynne was also Heylin's violent enemy, and afterwards brought him into trouble for some remarks which he made on one of Prynne's Works. (Wood, ut sup. col. 556.)

[2] Diary, p. 31.

an information to be laid against the self-elected corporation in the Court of Exchequer, at the instance of Noy, the attorney-general, because it was an illegal association: and the result was, that in 1632, when this confederacy was broken up, only thirteen impropriations had been purchased for five or six thousand pounds, and these were confiscated to the King's use.

The impropriations were generally bought at twelve years' purchase, and had the feoffees been actuated by other motives than the advancement of their faction, of which that renowned Puritan Dr. Preston was a leader, the feoffment, *as a charity*, would not have been unworthy, perhaps, of support. But the truth is, that the design was too evident to be concealed. There were then in England 9284 benefices, and of these 3845 were either attached to colleges and cathedrals, or in the hands of laymen. The feoffees, in endeavouring to obtain possession of the lay impropriations, merely made a transferrence of the patronage, from one individual, perhaps, into their own hands. They had not the slightest intention to increase the revenues of the poorer livings to which the impropriations belonged, but setting up their lectureships in towns to which factious individuals chiefly resorted, they attached salaries to these lectureships, in prejudice to the poorer clergy. The religion of the Puritans consisted in preaching, and the furtherance of this was their grand object. It was their intention to make these lectureships serve as schools for the training

of their novices, to strengthen the sectarian interest, and to prepare the way silently but surely for the introduction of the Presbyterianism of Geneva. The feoffees were all Nonconformists, men well known for their disaffection to the Government; and Puritans were only presented to the lectureships, who had been interdicted by the Bishop or the Commission; and who, of course, would do their utmost to foster the prejudice against the regular clergy. The lecturers, moreover, were entirely dependent on this self-elected corporation, being annually liable to removal, if they offended their patrons. It is evident, therefore, that the cause was extremely liable to suspicion; the regular clergy were deprived of their incomes; their situations would have been miserable from the intrusion of factious zealots, stimulated by their extravagant enthusiasm: and, as these preachers were entirely dependent on the humours of their patrons, who served their own purpose by not fixing them for life, it was natural that they should preach as their patrons pleased. The worst consequences were most likely to ensue from these measures: in market towns the parliamentary elections would be swayed by those zealots who had left the Church, and thus the return of well-known malcontents to the House of Commons would be secured. On the whole, Laud rightly alleged, that "the feoffees were the main instruments for the Puritan faction to undo the Church." — "I was," says Laud, "clearly of opinion, that this was a cunning way,

under a glorious pretence, to overthrow the church government, by getting into their power more dependency of the clergy than the King, the Peers, and all the Bishops in the kingdom had. And I did conceive that the plot was more dangerous for the fairness of the pretence, and that to the State as well as the Church." He adds his reasons for proceeding against this self-elected body, which are the following. "1. Because little or nothing was given by them to the present incumbent, to whom the tythes were due, if to any, that the parishioners who payed them might have the more cheerful instruction, the better hospitality, and greater relief for the poor. 2. Most of the men they put in were persons disaffected to the discipline, if not the doctrine too, of the Church of England. 3. Because no small sum was given to schoolmasters, to season youth *ab ovo* for their party, and to young students in the University, to purchase them over to their party, when they came abroad into the Church. 4. Because all this power to nourish and maintain a faction was in the hands of twelve men, who, though never so honest and free from thoughts of abusing this power to fill the Church with schism, yet who should be successors, and whatever should be made of this power, was not of human reach to know. 5. Because this power was assumed by, and to themselves, without any legal authority [1]."

[1] Diary, p. 47. Troubles and Trials, p. 372, 373. Heylin, p. 200. Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 151, 152. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 754.

These are arguments not easily refuted, and it must be admitted that the proceedings against those feoffees were highly expedient and necessary. Their corporation was not finally overthrown till 1632, when it was found that the association was illegal, and it was reserved for farther consideration whether a criminal process should not be exhibited against them, and, if so, whether in the Court of Exchequer or the Star Chamber. As the individuals, however, were found to have been considerable losers, and to have acted honourably, all farther prosecution was suspended. The capital belonging to them in this affair was confiscated to the King; a measure, however, which, I confess, can hardly be justified.

In the latter part of these remarks I have anticipated a year, but I wished to finish the subject, more especially as it forms the third article of the "things which Laud had projected to do," already quoted, namely, "to overthrow the feoffment, dangerous both to Church and State, going under the specious pretence of buying up impropriations." We follow him now in various transactions in which he was engaged; and this year he began to adorn St. John's College, Oxford, with elegant buildings.

This distinguished College, which owes its foundation to the munificence of Sir Thomas White, consists at present of two large quadrangular courts. The original buildings formed part of St. Bernard's College, on the site of which St. John's is founded; Sir T. White having purchased that

property from the prior at the Dissolution. At that time the college consisted of only one quadrangle, but Sir William Paddy, who founded and endowed the choir, built that side of the new or inner quadrangle on the south, which contains the Library. Laud resolved to extend the buildings of the Society; on the 23d of July, 1631, he laid the first stone of the inner quadrangle, and the three sides he built at his own expence, without interruption, till the work was completed, from a design by Inigo Jones, who was indebted to Laud for his first employment at Oxford. These three sides cost him 5000*l.* and were completed in 1635. The King, acquainted with his munificent design, which he intended to carry on at his sole expence, presented him with two hundred tons of timber from the royal woods of Shotover and Stow, against which the Lord Treasurer Weston fruitlessly remonstrated.

The inner quadrangle of St. John's is a splendid monument of the taste and munificence of Laud, and is worthy of the great prelate. On the east side of the outer quadrangle, is a passage leading to that built by Laud, and on the east and west sides are splendid piazzas, or cloisters, in the Grecian style, each column consisting of a single stone, dug from a quarry near Fifield, in Berkshire, on an estate which belongs to the Society. In the centre of these sides is a magnificent gateway, of the Doric order, corresponding with the piazzas, surmounted by a semi-circular pediment of the Ionic and Corinthian orders, having a statue on either side between

the columns, in brass, that on the right, of Charles I. and that on the left, of his Queen, Henrietta Maria, both designed and cast by Fanelli, of Florence. These two statues cost Laud 400*l.* exclusive of the sum for building the quadrangle. On the east side, above the cloisters, supported by eight round arches, beautifully ornamented with busts of the four Cardinal and Christian virtues, and Religion, above each pillar, besides other apartments, is a magnificent gallery, stored with book-cases and MSS. opening on the south from the Library, part of which is in the upper story of this side, for the purposes of study and meditation. The north and west sides contain suitable apartments for the members of the Society, supported by similar cloisters. The Library is enriched by valuable manuscripts, many of which were presented by Laud; and, besides his other benefactions, he bestowed a yearly sum on the College of 500*l.* In the Hall, on the right of the full length portrait of the munificent founder of St. John's, is the portrait of Laud, and on the left the portrait of Bishop Juxon, who presented the Society with a benefaction of 7000*l.*

Besides erecting the inner quadrangle of St. John's, which was not finished till 1635, Laud also erected a structure towards the west of the Bodleian Library and Divinity School, in order that St. Mary's Church might be kept exclusively for divine worship, and that there might be a suitable building for the Public Congregations and Convocations of the University. The lower part of this structure

he designed for the accommodation of the University public meetings; and the upper part was for the reception of books, having an opening towards the left wing, and here were deposited his own MSS. &c. Some of his other plans, however, were frustrated by the reluctance of the owners of certain houses to sell their property; for he had projected to clear a great square between St. Mary's and the Schools, whereon the Radcliffe Library now stands, and to have raised there a lofty room, supported by noble pillars; the upper part to accommodate Convocations, the lower to serve as a place of general resort for the students when attending the Schools, the Library, or on any public occasion [1].

Nor was Laud less active in his other employments at this period, for, besides the punctual visitation of his diocese, he was also engaged in considering the repairs of his own cathedral, St. Paul's, afterwards imputed to him as a crime. This work he rightly thought ought to be defrayed by the nation, and a tax was accordingly levied, which occasioned the remark to be made, that "St. Paul's was repaired by the sins of the people." Nothing could be more necessary than the repair of this ancient structure; from various causes it had been suffered to fall into decay, and though James had issued a commission in 1620-1, to enquire into its state, and to report what money would be neces-

[1] Wood, Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxon. lib. ii. p. 310, 311.

sary for its repair, yet, from the necessities of that monarch, his death, the inactivity of Montaigne, Bishop of the See, and the turbulence of the times, the burden devolved on Laud, who was resolved, by repairing this magnificent and ancient pile, to advance religion, and to rescue from dilapidation an edifice rendered venerable by the lapse of many ages. A commission was accordingly issued, bearing date the 10th of April, 1631, appointing the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, the Lord Mayor, &c. Lord Coventry, Keeper of the Great Seal, and various Aldermen and other officers of the metropolis, to superintend all contributions, legacies, and taxes, for aiding this great work. The next year the work was begun, Laud himself contributing liberally from the revenues of his bishopric, nor did he cease throughout his life, while in the days of his prosperity, even after his removal from the See, to use his utmost exertions to forward this great design.

These proceedings, however, were not allowed to pass unnoticed by the Puritans. Their clownish taste, rendered more barbarous by their notions about spiritual worship, urged them to declaim most violently against the repair of this cathedral, terming it, says Dr. Heylin, "the repairing and adorning of a rotten relic, insinuating to the people, as they found occasion, that it was more agreeable to rules of piety to demolish such old monuments of superstition and idolatry, than to retain

them." To them it appeared utterly useless to bestow any attention upon the venerable cathedrals, and, besides the clamours which they raised against it, some of their leaders insinuated, that it was a mere contrivance of the court to extort money from the people without the aid of Parliament. The preaching zealots artfully introduced it into their sermons, and, with all that craftiness for which they were remarkable, endeavoured to restrain the contributors by rousing their fears as to Popery and Arminianism. But, notwithstanding this opposition, the work went on with considerable spirit: upwards of 100,000*l.* were collected through Laud's exertions, the sum of 10,295*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* being contributed by the King alone, besides various sums by private individuals. Before the year 1640, the work was almost finished, but in the following year misfortunes overtook Laud, the great promoter of the work, and at length the violence of the times caused it altogether to be suspended. In the ever-memorable Fire of London, 1666, this ancient and venerable edifice was destroyed, otherwise it also would have been an additional monument of Laud's piety and munificence; but the record of his exertions yet remains, in which it is at once seen, that, like the ancient Jewish King, he was not guided by selfishness in his ideas regarding the public edifices of religion. Yet his atrocious enemies, on a future occasion, alleged his disinterested conduct in this affair as a mortal crime, "so easy a thing it is," as the learned Heylin remarks, "to disgrace the man

whom the weight of his afflictions has once made incapable of bearing up against such reproaches as the tongue and pens of his revilers shall accumulate upon him." Nevertheless, the conscious homage to truth was, after all, extorted from them, as in the case of Deering, who declared of Laud, that, die when he would, "St. Paul's would be his perpetual monument."

While thus engaged, however, in designs which sufficiently indicated his greatness of soul, his piety, and munificence, and which, connected as they all were with religion and learning, may not unjustly entitle him to be called the Mecænas of his age, Laud was not forgetful of the duties he was called to perform as Chancellor of one of the most ancient and splendid seats of learning in Europe. It has already been said, that he was no sooner elected Chancellor of Oxford, than, determined to make his office no nominal dignity, he thought it his duty, to use his own words, "to reform the University, which was extremely sunk from all discipline, and fallen into licentiousness," so much indeed, that various complaints were made to him, that if remedies were not applied in time, "there would scarce any face be left of an University." This lamentable departure from all good order had been chiefly induced by the enthusiasm of the Puritans, who, determined to oppose every measure which was not sanctioned by the leaders of their party, had contributed their influence to improve the statutes which had been suffered to fall into decay. Having

been successful in prohibiting for the future those disorders which attended the election of the Proctors, Laud, in the very year in which he was elected Chancellor, by various regulations, began the work of reformation. He had been attacked by one preacher that year, on the 2d of May, who, from the pulpit of St. Mary's, preached against every outward sign of devotion, and endeavoured to set forth the puritanical notions about spiritual holiness. Another, on the contrary, attacked the Synod of Dort, and reprobated the Calvinistic dogmas of election and reprobation. In this he went directly against the King's proclamation, which expressly prohibited any man from reviving these unhappy disputes. Both were censured with the utmost impartiality. It extended, however, only to an admonition, "for I am not willing," says Laud, in reply to Dr. John Tolson, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, who had written to him on the subject, "that they should be punished, because I would not be too severe at my first coming into office; as I know that those sermons were written before I was Chancellor."

But the Bishop saw enough to convince him that there were factious individuals in the University, whose silence would not be enjoined by any lenient procedure. He held a weekly correspondence with the Vice-Chancellor; he had already enforced a more diligent attention to the study of the Hebrew

[7] Gestis Cancellarii Laud, P. 8.

language, and procured a prebend of Christ Church to be annexed to that Professorship for ever; and he revived that respect due to the degree of Master of Arts, which had fallen into disesteem. For these, and other measures, which it is impossible in this place to enumerate, Laud received the thanks of the University, the Hebrew Professor, and the Proctors[1]. Yet this year was characterised by farther disturbances, in which Laud's conduct and impartiality were conspicuous in his decisions.

It gave great offence to the Puritan enthusiasts in the University, that the statutes should be put in order and discipline enforced; and, therefore, they had resolved on all public occasions to disturb the government, and to incite the Proctors to a variance with the Chancellor. At the head of this factious cabal was suspected to be the Regius Professor of Divinity, "whose name," says Laud, "I shall spare, rather for his coat than himself." Accordingly, on the 24th of May 1631, one Thomas Hill, of Hart Hall, in a sermon preached in St. Mary's, indulged himself in a most eloquent invective against the Church. "And here, were my time and learning parallel to my zeal," said he, "what a tempting doth present itself, to shew how rashly (that I say not cruelly) our Pelagian votaries have handled the decrees and statutes of the King. But they are to be mischieved into honour, (but no matter how) which tempts them to disrelish sound

[1] Gestis, ut sup. p. 11—17, &c. MSS. Reg. R. fol. 24.

doctrine on no other ground than did David, because the lords do not favour it. Scripture they use worse than the Turks do Christians at Tunis, enslave it to the vassalage of the foulest error, and, according to their most current garb, employ it to defend Popery, or, as bad, Pelagianism. Popish darts, whet afresh on a Dutch grindstone, have pierced deep, and without speedy succour will prove mortal. I am persuaded these transmarine tenets had not been so fully and brief among us, nor the opposite truth so diametrically condemned by many, had they first made proof of their points in their own retired and curious contemplation."

For these expressions Hill was compelled to make a recantation on the 16th of July, in a public Convocation, and to express his penitence in an ample manner; and Prynne has, therefore, taken occasion to observe, that the punishment of this prating preacher afforded triumph to the Arminian faction, "who grew very bold," says he, "having both the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor on their side [1]." The Puritans, however, were resolved to continue their opposition, and "some young divines," as Prynne designates them, "moved with a pious zeal and indignation," commenced a new attack, in open defiance of the King's Proclamation prohibiting any discussions in public concerning predestination, about which these religionists were absolutely phrensied.

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 174.

That there was a secret plot or understanding among the zealots, is not improbable, and three of them brought themselves into very prominent notice, Thomas Ford of Magdalen Hall, Giles Thome of Balliol College, and William Hodges of Exeter College; each of whom preached seditious sermons, in which they attacked the Church, and those whom they termed Arminians, but on whom they now bestowed the names of Pelagians and Demi-Pelagians, reflecting also, in an invidious manner on the royal instructions. The text of Hodges was well chosen for an inflammatory harangue, being taken from Numbers iv. "Let us make a captain, and return into Egypt." The Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Smith, of Wadham College, immediately called them to account for their conduct, and required them to deliver their sermons; but they disputed his authority in these matters, and appealed from him to the Convocation. Their appeal was received by the Proctors, whose duty it was to have obeyed the instructions of the Vice-Chancellor, and named delegates to take the matter into consideration. The Vice-Chancellor had no other resource left than an appeal to the King.

Dr. Brian Duppa, Dean of Christ Church, in the mean time wrote an account of these proceedings to Laud, who, as Chancellor, was more immediately concerned. In his letter, dated August 1, 1632, he asserts, "I have not hitherto troubled your Lordship with letters of information, concerning any of our University affairs, knowing into what sufficient

hands you have committed the trust of them, whence, I imagine, you receive a weekly account. But such hath been the height of our late disorders, both within and without the pulpit, that, were I not to express in some way my trouble at it, I might be reckoned a very insensible member of the body which you govern. The late uproars strike at the very root of government. The Vice-Chancellor's power is questioned; the Proctors that should assist him receive the appeals of the delinquents, and the delegates, such as are, are rather parties than judges. I could wish this were all, but this gangrene will spread further, for the University, by these means, is likely to become the seedplot of mutinies, to harass both Church and commonwealth. But my comfort is, that the way of their own choosing, the way of appeals (which, it may be, at first they did not think of) must at least end before his sacred Majesty, for there is nothing left but the voice of such a power to allay the storm [1]."

The insolence of the Puritan preachers, and the injudicious conduct of the Proctors and Delegates, attracted the notice of the whole University, and Laud was resolved that this contumacy should receive its due reward. Accordingly, on his application to the King, the monarch informed him that he would hear the cause at Woodstock, when he came thither during a short progress of the Court. On

[1] Gestis Cancellarii, p. 35. Wood, by Gutch, vol. ii. Part i. p. 375, 376.

Tuesday, the 23d of August, the cause was heard in presence of the King, the Chancellor, and the Lords of the Council, when it was commanded, that Ford, Thome, and Hodges be expelled the University; that the two Proctors be deprived of their places, and the Delegates, Prideaux, Rector of Exeter College, and Wilkinson, Principal of Magdalene Hall, be publicly censured and reproved, for patronising the enthusiasm of the faction [1].

Having thus silenced the Calvinistic disorders, it must not be forgotten that the impartiality of Laud in these transactions was manifest, and that he acted thus, not because he was opposed to the dogmas of Calvin, but because he was resolved that these subjects should not be publicly discussed. In the following year, Robert Rainsford, in a sermon at St. Mary's, publicly defended the doctrine of universal grace, and was accordingly charged by Dr. Prideaux, who seems to have forgotten the leniency which he had himself experienced. A summons was immediately issued to Rainsford, and he was most magisterially compelled to make a public acknowledgment of his fault in discussing themes which had been proscribed by the royal instructions. Yet this, and other instances of impartiality which might be adduced to shew, that the Calvinistic faction was not the only party opposed, did not satisfy the preaching zealots. In the month

[1] Gestis Cancellarii, p. 36—50, &c. Reg. R. fol. 37, 38, &c. Hist. and Antiq. of Oxford, by Wood, edited by Gutch, vol. ii. p. 376—381.

of September some satirical verses were dispersed at Oxford, entitled, "The Academicall Army of Epidemicall Arminians, to the Tune of the Souldier," in which the Vice-Chancellor and others were severely mentioned, with Laud, the Chancellor, who was styled their general. One Rogers, of Jesus College, was suspected to be the author, and he was accordingly expelled the University, but he was restored by Laud in the following year [1].

It is evident from these instances, that Laud's situation as Chancellor was not one of mere honour, and that it required a man of his vigorous and active mind to govern with firmness and decision. The leaven of Puritanism was still cherished in the University, and frequently its votaries exhibited their dangerous enthusiasm. Absolutely phrensied with zeal for the diffusion of the doctrine of election, those factious spirits, as they have not been inaptly termed, resolved to bid defiance to all order and government. The zealots of those days forgot that the main design of preaching is to call sinners to repentance; nor do they seem to have been aware, that they might retain their Calvinistic notions, and yet abstain from them in the pulpit. But their faith consisted exclusively in holding certain doctrines which they conceived to be the sufficient test of orthodoxy, and, like the modern evangelicals, in adopting a certain phraseology, which they believed

[1] Wood's Hist. and Antiq. ut supra, p. 381—385. Heylin, p. 203. Diary, 46. Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 141, 142.

to possess a talismanic charm. With the Puritans there was no religion unless it was grounded on Calvin, and there was equally no religion if unaccompanied by their bewildering expositions of predestination. Laud, however, thought otherwise. He had no wish to keep Calvinists out of the Church, because he knew there were many such who despised the Puritan follies, and who would adorn the Church by their piety and learning. But it was his earnest wish, as it must be the wish of every sincere friend of religion, to avoid public disputations; and he rightly conceived, that, as religious matters must appear in a different light to various individuals, men, while they agreed on fundamental doctrines, might hold their own opinions on minor points, and yet preserve peace and order in the Church. And who, then, was in reality the liberal man? Laud, who insisted that men might preach, and yet avoid the absurdities of predestination, whether they believed these or not; or the Puritan zealot, who thought that there was no religion unless it maintained the notions of Calvin?

The disorders excited by predestination, however, were not confined exclusively to England. In the Irish Church, concerning which more in another place, Usher, the celebrated primate, and the first scholar on the foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, who, though a Calvinist, was indebted for his advancement to Laud, had published a work in the Latin tongue this year, in which he opposed Arminianism, which he viewed as a dangerous doctrine.

He had employed himself for some time in endeavouring to ascertain the origin of the predestinarian controversy; and meeting with a remarkable tract on the subject, he published it in Dublin, 1631. This tract, which appeared in quarto, was the first book printed in Ireland in the Latin language. It is entitled, "Goteschalci et Predestinarianæ Controversiæ ab eo motæ Historia," and is dedicated to Vossius, "a right learned man," says Heylin, "who had written a book which had been much cried up by the Remonstrants," and to whom Usher would have presented the deanery of Armagh[1]. The Irish primate, in his haste to oppose what he called Arminianism, (and yet he changed his opinions of it in after life,) had employed himself for twelve years in making collections for a history of predestination, but when he had produced the history by Vossius, he chose rather to give up the intention, and published only the tract by Goteschalc, which had never been printed, and which he had procured from France[2]. The book, however, being in Latin,

[1] Parr's Collection, Letter 144, dated February 3, 1629.

[2] Parr's Collection, Letter 149, dated December 10, 1630. It is remarkable, that so much time and labour should have been expended on the elucidation of this absurd doctrine by men of the greatest talents, and who might have employed themselves to much better purpose. From the letters referred to written to Dr. Ward, it would appear that the Calvinists were termed by the Arminians, Predestinarians, and they in turn by their opponents Semi-Pelagians. But Arminianism has no more connexion with Pelagianism than it has with Popery, though it is difficult for Calvinists to deny that Predestination is not another word for religious necessity.

and the mass of the Irish people of that age not being remarkable for the extent of their knowledge, it was less likely to produce the same effects as another which Dr. Downham, Bishop of Derry, had set forth on the perseverance of the saints. The primate's book, therefore, gave little offence, and perhaps the government was reluctant to proceed against him; but the Bishop of Derry's book was suppressed by royal proclamation, addressed to Archbishop Usher himself, bearing date August 24, 1631, the very day after the three Oxford Puritans had received their sentence of expulsion. This, moreover, would operate by the way of a hint to himself, that the agitating of this controversy would offend the King. Many copies, however, of Downham's treatise had been circulated, before the order was duly published, but instructions were at the same time forwarded to Dr. William Bedell, the pious Bishop of Kilmore, and translator of the Irish Bible, to observe the publications of the Calvinists, that nothing should be printed contrary to the royal Declaration[1].

It was while at Woodstock, too, as Heylin informs us, that Laud, whose enemies were continually on the watch, suffered some expressions to escape him, which were immediately interpreted to indicate his opinions on the marriage of the clergy. Being himself unmarried, and, withal, often vilified for his alleged Popish inclinations, it was immediately con-

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 750.

cluded, that he advocated the doctrine of ecclesiastical celibacy, and disapproved of the conduct of those who had acted contrary to his own example. No report could be more malevolent or unfounded; for, though perhaps he might be guided in his disposal of ecclesiastical preferments by those private opinions which induced him rather to promote those who were unmarried than those who were encumbered, yet the doctrine of celibacy was never for a moment conceived by him as justifiable or expedient. And accordingly, to shew that this report was the gratuitous invention of his Puritan enemies, he negotiated a marriage between one of his own chaplains and a daughter of his old and tried friend, Sir Francis Windebank; "officiating," says Heylin, "in the whole service of their marriage in his own chapel at London House, joining their hands, giving the nuptial benediction, and performing all other ecclesiastical rites, which belong to the solemnization of matrimony by the rules of this Church [1]."

The year 1632 is remarkable for nothing more than the changes which took place at Court, in the administration, and in the Church. Wentworth was sent to Ireland, as Lord Deputy, where he displayed, in an eminent degree, his remarkable ability for government. The interest of Laud procured for his friend, Windebank, the office of Secretary of State, to which office he was sworn on the 15th of June 1632, in the room of Dudley

[1] Heylin, p. 212.

Carleton, Viscount Dorchester, deceased. Sir Francis Cottington had succeeded the Lord Treasurer Weston in the office of Chancellor, and also Sir Robert Nanton as Master of the Wards and Liveries, an appointment which induced a dispute between him and the Lord Keeper Coventry, concerning the disposal of the King's benefices. But the greatest changes were in the Church; and here Laud distinguished himself as a wise governor. Determined to oppose both Popery and Puritanism, he promoted the grandeur of the ecclesiastical establishment with unwearied industry, displaying his accustomed integrity, and recommending those only to the King whom he reckoned of the greatest conscientiousness and public spirit. The previous year, three great prelates had died. Dr. Samuel Harsnet, Archbishop of York, a pious and learned theologian, who has received his share of odium from the Puritans for his alleged attention to ceremonies, and the first who distinguished those zealots who conformed rather from policy than principle by the epithet of *Conformable Puritans:* Dr. John Buckeridge, the pious and venerable Bishop of Ely, who had been Laud's tutor, and with whom he had ever preserved the most uninterrupted friendship: and Dr. John Howson, Bishop of Durham, a prelate alike distinguished for his learning, and the diligent discharge of his episcopal functions.

These vacancies, from the peculiar situation of the Church, and the state of the times, required to be filled with peculiar care; and, as the responsi-

bility rested on Laud, great caution was necessary on his part. But he well understood the Church, and he as well knew those who had its welfare at heart. His old friend, Bishop Neile, who had defended him on every emergency, was accordingly translated from Winchester to the Archiepiscopal See of York, though that good prelate would have preferred remaining in the See of Winchester. This removal occasioned a vacancy of two offices, the clerkship of the closet at Court, and a vacancy in the Cathedral of Winchester, belonging to the Bishop. But, that "he might have some one whom he could trust, near his Majesty, were he to grow weak or infirm," as he remarks in the Diary[1], Laud's influence promoted Dr. William Juxon, Dean of Worcester, and President of St. John's, both of which offices he had previously procured for that excellent ecclesiastic. Winchester being vacant, Dr. Walter Curle, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who had been translated thence from Rochester, 1629, was removed to that See, and Dr. William Pierce, Bishop of Peterborough, succeeded him in Bath and Wells[2]. Dr. Francis White, who had signalized himself by his opposition to the Papists, was removed from Norwich to Ely, in the room of Bishop Buckeridge, this prelate having been promoted from Carlisle, his first Diocese, to Norwich, in 1628[3]. Dr. William Corbet was promoted from

[1] Diary, p. 47.

[2] Le Neve's Fasti Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ, p. 34.

[3] Le Neve, p. 212.

Oxford to Norwich[1], and Dr. John Bancroft was consecrated to the See of Oxford[2]. Dr. Thomas Morton, who had been promoted to the episcopal dignity in 1616, by being raised to the Bishopric of Chester, and in 1618, to Lichfield and Coventry[3], was removed to Durham;—"a man he was," says Heylin, "who for the greatest part of his time had exercised his pen against the Papists," and no less opposed to the Puritans, as appears by his book entitled, "A Defence of the three harmless Ceremonies of the Church of England," published at London, 1619, which gave great satisfaction to King James. Dr. Robert Wright was removed from Bristol to Lichfield and Coventry[5], and Dr. Augustine Linsell was elected to the vacant See of Peterborough[6].

Having thus endeavoured to secure the peace and prosperity of the Church, by aiding in the promotion of men who had its interest at heart, Laud, whose vigilance was unremitting, at this time commenced a prosecution against the King's Printers, for omitting the word *not* in the Seventh Commandment of the Decalogue. This prosecution, which could be liable to no just objection, was, nevertheless, recollected at a future period by his fanatical enemies. Laud had informed Charles of the fact, and the printers were cited before the High Commission, to which court the press was entrusted.

[1] Le Neve's Fasti Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ, p. 228.
[2] Ibid. p. 229. [3] Ibid. p. 126. [4] Ibid. p. 48.
[5] Ibid. p. 239. [6] Heylin, p. 215.

The whole impression of the edition was called in, the printers severely fined, and, with part of that fine, he purchased various manuscripts, with the intention of publishing them. "Of which sort," says Heylin, "were the Catena and Theophylact of Linsell," the bishop-elect of Peterborough; "a solid divine," says that author in another place, "and a learned linguist, to whom the Christian world remains indebted for Theophylact's Comment on the Epistles, and the Catena upon Job, published by him in Greek and Latin." It appears, however, that this was not the only blunder in this edition. "Among them (the printers and correctors,)" says Laud, "their negligence was such, as that there were found above a thousand faults in two editions of the Bible and Common Prayer Book, and one which caused this search was, that in Exodus xx. where they had shamefully printed, Thou shalt commit adultery. For this the Masters of the printing-house were called into the High Commission, and censured, as they well deserved [1]."

It was this year that Henry Sherfield, the Recorder of Salisbury, was fined for his sacrilegious attacks on Salisbury Cathedral, in 1629, in which, as has been already mentioned, stimulated by his fanatical zeal, he destroyed a window of stained glass, of great antiquity. He was prosecuted at the instance of Dr. Davenant, the Bishop, and, besides being fined, and deprived of his Recorder-

[1] Troubles and Trials, &c.

ship, he was compelled to make a public acknowledgment of the outrage he had committed. But another individual was this year called in question, of greater consequence, and one of the most violent fanatics of that age, who afterwards made himself notorious by his conduct in the infamous prosecution against Laud.

William Prynne, already frequently introduced to the notice of the reader in his capacity of author, and an incendiary of no ordinary description, was born at Swansicke near Bath, in the year 1600, and was admitted Commoner of Oriel College, Oxford, in 1616, where he took his degree of Bachelor in 1620. He afterwards removed to Lincoln's Inn, and, in the profession of law, he was successively barrister, bencher, and reader. Becoming an ardent admirer of that noted Puritan enthusiast, Dr. John Preston, who, Neal informs us, "affected the very language of Calvin," he determined to exert himself in defence of the Calvinistic tenets, and to lift up his voice against what he conceived to be the gross vices of the age. His zeal for the predestinarian doctrines amounted to a phrenzy; he entertained a mortal hatred towards the Church, and to every thing which did not emanate from the metropolis of Calvinism, Geneva. With the view of inculcating his notions, he commenced author in 1627, and he made no secret of his antipathy towards Church and State. The first essay of this abnormous genius, as he has been not unaptly termed, was, "The Perpetuity of a Regenerate Man's Estate, against

the Saint's Total and Final Apostacy," in which he sets forth the Calvinistic notion of the perseverance of the saints. Having, in this first effusion, with all the zeal of an apostle, done his utmost to prove his favourite dogma, he next commenced Puritan reformer of life and manners, and, in 1628, he gave to the world other two productions :—" Health's Sicknesse, or a Compendious and Brief Discourse of the Sinfulnesse of Drinking and Pledging Healths," and " The Unloveliness of Love-Lockes." In the same year, he published his animadversions on Dr. Cosin's book, entitled the " Collection of Private Devotions, or Hours of Prayer," in a tract, " Brief Censure of Mr. Cosin's cozening Devotions," which was answered by Giles Widdows, M.A. his former tutor at Oriel College, in a tract entitled, " The Lawless, Kneeless, Schismatical Puritan," published at Oxford, in 1631, and whom Prynne abused in a most shameful manner in one of his subsequent effusions. In 1629, appeared another of Prynne's works, " The Church of England's old Antithesis to Arminianism," and, in the same year, besides this piece, to which he prefixed the general title of " Anti-Arminianism," appeared another, " God no Impostor or Deluder, or an Answer to a Popish and Arminian Cavil in Defence of Free-Will and Universal Grace." Having entered with much zeal into the controversies of the age, and conducted himself with the utmost insolence towards the civil authorities, he of necessity became bolder in disseminating his notions, and it

was suspected, not, perhaps, without reason, that he had the countenance of Abbot, the Primate, with whom he was at that time intimate. This Mastyx, therefore, published a pamphlet, entitled, "Lame Giles his Haultings, or a brief Survey of Giles Widdowes, his Confutation of an Appendix concerning Bowing at the Name of Jesus," &c. 1631, in which, as the title indicates, this fanatical zealot, losing all respect for his former tutor, abused him in the most virulent and unjustifiable manner, quoting for his mottoes, which were then much in fashion, Prov. xxvi. 3, 5. and the passage from Horace, Sermon. lib. ii. Sat. 3. "O major tandem parcus infane minori[1]."

[1] As a specimen of Prynne's manner in this pamphlet, and of the gross abuse which he bestowed on a learned man, in his address to the University of Oxford, whom he calls "his much honoured mother," he says "This son of yours which I meane, one Giles Widdowes, a poore haulting widow in troth, for traine, and learning, of which hee never had two mites, of whom I cannot say, as Festus did of Paul, that too much learning did make him mad, but want of wit. These errors and oversights of his, with which I here acquaint you, are contained in a new divulged booke, much like the Authour, intituled, 'The Lawlesse, Kneelesse, Schismatical Puritan,' &c. In confutation of which I need say no more to such as know him, but that Giles Widdowes, Rectour of St. Martin's Church in Oxford, was the authour." In another place, addressing Widdowes, he says, "Mistake me not, as though I wrote this to you to suppresse your answer. Alas! it is so illiterate, so absurdly impertinent in most things, that I rather pitty than feare it. My only meaning is, to forestall your printed oversights, which are so many, so absurd, that most will deem you crack-brained when

This enthusiast, however, had he merely confined himself to polemical disputation, would most likely have remained unnoticed, but in Christmas, 1632[1], appeared his famous work, entitled, "Histrio Mastyx, the Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedie, divided into Two Parts[2]." In the pamphlet formerly noticed, he had embraced several opportunities of declaring his sentiments on the subject, and he makes use of the argument, which, he says, "Tertullian writes of stage plays, which had the very devill himselfe for their originall authour, as he, with others, largely proves." This volume gave great offence to the court, as it was written insidiously to abuse the Queen, who delighted in the gaieties of masquerades, dancings, and theatrical exhibitions, and who, in fact, is coupled with the opprobrious epithets which he bestows on "Play haunters," especially women, all of whom, without exception, he styles "notorious

you penned, if not the receiver hare-brained, when he authorized them." And, addressing the University, he talks about "the brazen-faced impudency of her sonne Giles," and his "franticke oversights," whose "foolish scribbling goosequills," he hopes, will be consigned to "everlasting peace." This, and much more, too, for presuming to write against such a man as William Prynne.

[1] In the title-page it bears date 1633, because the year then began at Michaelmas.

[2] Prynne's book was answered in 1662, in a work entitled, "Theatrum Redivivum, or the Theatre vindicated, by Sir Richard Baker, in answer to Mr. Prynne's Histrio-Mastyx," 8vo. London.

whores," "known or suspected harlots[1]." Dancing is "the devil's procession and invention," and the "devil danceth in dancing women[2];" love-locks are the "wishes of vanity, whereby the devil holds and leads men captive." The book, in short, as Heylin well remarks, "breathed nothing but disgrace to the nation, infamy to the Church (as he had thought proper to condemn all music) reproaches to the court, dishonour to the Queen, and some things which were thought to be tending to the destruction of his Majesty's person[3]." Even the most innocent amusements were censured by this fanatical incendiary, damnation was threatened to all who opposed him, abundance of quotations he produced, which he imagined supported his positions. The Histrio Mastyx was, however, universally condemned, both on account of its language, and the total want of respect shewn to the King; and the lawyers testified their dissent from the absurd arguments of a member of their body, by publicly presenting to the King and Queen a mask at Whitehall, the managers of which consisted of members of the Temple, Gray's, and Lincoln's Inns[4]. The gloomy Calvinistic Puritans alone rejoiced in their misanthropy, in their scurrilous abuse, and in their mistaken notions concerning the exhortations and commands of Christianity.

But in this age such effusions could not be ex-

[1] Histrio Mastyx, p. 144, 145, &c. [2] Ibid. p. 228, 229.
[3] Heylin, p. 217. [4] Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 19.

pected to pass unnoticed, for although Prynne had overloaded his book by his learned quotations, there was enough in it to inflame the zealots in those days of religious excitement. His other performances, which were in themselves highly objectionable, had not been censured, and this leniency had only served to make him the more resolute in his opposition. Reflecting as it did on the court, holding up the King's family to ridicule, fulminating abuse and threats against the clergy, and reviling every rite and ceremony of the Church, a copy of his work was laid before the Privy-Council, and Dr. Heylin, who was a prebend of Westminster, was commanded to analyze those passages which breathed contempt and sedition. Noy, the attorney-general, was instructed to prefer an information against him, and Prynne himself, on the 1st of February, 1632-3, was apprehended, and committed to the Tower.

In the Tower, therefore, we shall leave this enthusiast, no doubt exulting in his achievements, boasting that he was suffering "for conscience sake," and meditating deep and dark revenge against Laud, whom he looked upon as his great opposer, until the trial, which shortly took place. On the 13th of February, the feoffees for impropriations, which have already been noticed, were condemned, a measure highly expedient and salutary for the Church. At this time, too, Laud engaged in various concerns relative to the Church of Eng-

land, an abstract of which Sir Francis Windebanke, the Secretary of State, presented to the Privy Council. This abstract contained two proposals, one concerning the state of religion in British factories and regiments abroad, the other professed to take into consideration the French and Dutch Churches in London, and in the various counties of England.

The members of the Factory at Hamburgh, though they were permitted the exercise of the worship of the Church, at length deserted to Calvinism and the discipline of Geneva, while the English who traded to, or settled in, Holland, were compelled to conform to the established religion. King James had resolved to rectify the disorders which existed among them, and, accordingly, he intimated to the members of the English factory that "he would set over them a moderator, to be inspector of their affairs;" but this, being directly opposed to their regard for the Genevan polity, produced a petition which was presented to the King in 1624 [1].

The death of the King soon after, diverted the attention of the government to other affairs, and the English, in the mean time, were allowed to proceed with their Genevan discipline at Hamburgh. While the French and the Dutch churches in London and elsewhere adhered most tenaciously to the forms prescribed by the churches of their respective Countries, the members of the Church of England

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 751, 752.

on the Continent disregarded all order and subordination, and eagerly attached themselves to every novelty which might gratify their individual desires of government. The Genevan ritual was observed to the fullest extent; the Book of Common Prayer was set aside; and while all the privileges of a Church connected with the Church of England were granted to the Factories by the law, they employed those privileges to encourage sectarianism, and to declaim against what Calvin was pleased to term the *tolerabiles ineptiæ* of the Common Prayer. In this state of things, Leicester and Anstruther, two ambassadors from England, the one to the court of Denmark, the other to the Emperor of Germany, were appointed to repair to Hamburgh, to wait the arrival of Admiral Pennington, who was to convey them home. The vessels under the command of the admiral had not arrived, and an invitation was forthwith dispatched to the two ambassadors to attend at the English Church, and to permit their chaplains to do the public duty. Here, however, I shall lay Heylin's narration of the results before the reader, who was alive at the time, and had his information from the best authority. "This invitation was cheerfully accepted by both; the Earl of Leicester's chaplain first mounted the pulpit, and after a short psalm, according to the Genevan fashion, betakes himself to his sermon. The same was done by Johnson, (for I remember not," says Heylin, "the name of the other,) when it came to his turn. The vessels having arrived, and remaining for a change

of wind, the like courtesy was requested of Pennington, admiral of that little fleet for the present service. Pennington told them he had no chaplain, but there was in the ship one Dr. Ambrose, his friend and kinsman, who had been with him during the voyage, and he doubted not but he would readily accede to them if they made a request. An invitation having accordingly been given to Ambrose, and accepted, he attended the admiral to the place of worship, where he took his station very near the pulpit. The congregation being assembled, and the psalm half done, an *elder* was sent to remind him to go into the pulpit. Ambrose asked him to be accommodated with a Bible and Book of Common Prayer. The *elder* offered him a Bible, but told him that he had no Book of Common Prayer, and that those prayers were not used by them. 'Why then,' replied Dr. Ambrose, 'I have one of my own,' and forthwith he pulled a small Prayer Book from his pocket, and commenced the usual service of the Church. He had not, however, ended the general confession, when the chapel was in an uproar. The Elders, in great consternation, sent their former messenger to insist on Ambrose going into the pulpit, and not to *trouble* them with *Common Prayer!* Ambrose replied, that if they belonged to the Church of England, as they pretended, it was necessary that they should use the Liturgy; and if they would have no prayers, they should have no sermon. He proceeded with the service, when the messenger came to him a third time, telling him

that he must desist from a service which was altogether unnecessary. He immediately put the book in his pocket, and went out of the chapel, followed by the two ambassadors and the admiral, to the great honour of himself, and the confusion of Johnson (from whose mouth," adds Heylin, "I received the story) who, with the other chaplain, was thus shewn his error [1]."

I have transcribed this anecdote from Heylin, because it is not generally known, and because, being undeniably authentic, it is a sufficient argument to prove the necessity of Laud's plans for regulating the foreign churches in connexion with the Church of England. Under the primacy of Abbot, indeed, they were allowed to go on as they pleased, and hence the greatest danger was evident as long as they were subject to no control. Christianity, as I have remarked, is a religion of authority; but if men are permitted to reject that authority at will, there is no barrier to heresy or schism. Forms in public worship are indispensable; and, in reality, there is no service or ritual, however simple, destitute of them; uniformity is also necessary, otherwise there is no way of preventing religious feuds. The conduct of Ambrose will, doubtless, be condemned by the modern Dissenters, but it is manifest that their censure is utterly unfounded; for he did no more than what *they* would have done, in their own way, and which he had a right to do from conscien-

[1] Heylin, p. 218, 219.

tious motives. The Presbyterians, for example, will not allow any foreign society to be in connexion with them unless their practice is adopted; and in like manner, they denounce its members if they make use of any other forms than those which they prescribe. The same remark applies to the foreign churches in connexion with the Church of England, the dignitaries of which would ill discharge their duty, were they to be aware of the encroachments of sectarianism, fostered, it may be, by an enthusiastic desire for novelty, and yet not administer to their salutary discipline. Without discipline, in truth, there is no Church, and hence it is that the notions of Independency are with some persons devoutly cherished, because there are in many cases a gratification of the passions, of the individual desire for government, and because many are exalted into an ephemeral consequence which suits their own inclinations.

The reader, however, cannot fail to observe the striking resemblance there is between this transaction at Hamburgh, and that which took place at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in 1555. During the Marian persecution, several English exiles betook themselves to that city, and among them was Dr. Cox, who had been preceptor to Edward VI. Calvinism was then in its zenith, and the opinions of Calvin were duly inculcated in the English church in that city, by John Knox, the violent reformer of Scotland, who officiated there as minister. Of course, the Liturgy was treated with contempt by Knox,

it had been characterized by Calvin, his master, as abounding with *tolerable fooleries*[1]; and there are few persons acquainted with Knox's temper and actions, who need to be informed of the manner in which he frequently conducted public service, or the subjects which he sometimes discussed. Cox and his friends beheld with regret the enthusiasm of those English Protestants, excited by the Scotch preacher; but determined not to be restrained by the harangues of Knox, or the epistles of Calvin, they, in accordance with the practice of the Church, made the responses in a loud and audible voice, the first day they attended divine service, and on the next Sunday the Litany was read. This, which Dr. M'Crie is pleased to term "an insult upon the whole body," and "an outrage upon all order and decency[2]," was resented by Knox, who, in a sermon, took occasion to abuse Cox and his friends, and declared that in the Book of Common Prayer "*he* would undertake to prove publicly, that there were things imperfect, impure, and superstitious." As the exciter of an uproar, however, Knox's offensive rhetoric was resented, and at length primitive simplicity triumphed over Calvinistic novelties[3].

Laud saw the mischief which would arise from the laxity of discipline which prevailed in the Eng-

[1] Calvini Epist. p. 28, apud Opera, tom. ix. edit. 1667, fol. Amst.

[2] Life of John Knox, by Thomas M'Crie, D.D. of Edinburgh, 1813, 2d edit. vol. i. p. 148, 149, &c.

[3] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 393, 394, 395.

lish Church at Hamburgh, more especially as an example to other foreign chaplaincies, and accordingly he submitted to the Privy Council certain regulations, both with respect to foreign relations and also in reference to the French and Dutch churches in England. The sum of these regulations, ten in number, as it respects the former, was, that every chaplain intended for foreign service should conform in all things to the Church of England—that none should be admitted who had not so conformed—that those who had been admitted in an unqualified manner should be dismissed, if they did not conform within three months—that every minister and chaplain shall perform the ministerial duties according to the rules and rubrics of the Church of England—that cognizance shall be taken of every chaplain who presumes to defame the Church of England, and to preach against its doctrine and discipline—that no person be admitted to supply the place of a preacher, *pro tempore,* who has not conformed—that the governors of the factories and colonies be members of the Church, by which means they would be induced to bestow attention on those whom they employed as chaplains—that at every renewal by the merchants of their patents, a clause be inserted for the due observance of these instructions—that a yearly report be made of the progress of these regulations—and "that the English ministers in Holland, being his Majesty's born subjects, be not suffered to hold any classical meetings, and, at all

events, not to assume the power of ordination, from which, if they should not be restrained, there would be a perpetual seminary for schism and faction to the disturbance of this kingdom."

The regulations respecting the foreign churches in England were equally wise and salutary. Having represented the dangers and inconveniences which would arise from a want of sufficient regulations, Laud advises, "1. That the number of these foreigners in this kingdom be exactly computed, in order to judge of the practicability of bringing them to conform. 2. That for this purpose an order be issued by the government to take an exact list of them in their respective abodes: and that a certificate be returned of those of greatest interest and influence amongst them. 3. If they resolve to continue separate from Church and State, that they should then be under the common disadvantage of strangers, have all duties doubled upon them, and be unqualified for the privileges of natives. 4. That when it shall be thought necessary to bring them to the same condition with other subjects, they be warned in an ecclesiastical way to frequent their parish church, and conform themselves to the service and worship established: and, in case of non-compliance, to proceed against them by excommunication, and to serve the writ *de excommunicato capiendo* upon them[1]."

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 753. Heylin, p. 220, 221, 222. Neal, vol. ii. p. 237, 238.

These regulations we find Laud partly enforcing on a future occasion in his own province [1], and, besides being justifiable from the necessity of the times, they are undoubtedly founded on the very measures recommended by Elizabeth in the second year of her reign, in her letter to the Lord Treasurer Paulet, as quoted by Laud himself [2]. Prynne, indeed, asserts, that this was a stratagem of Laud "to subvert the Protestant religion," because those "Dutch and French churches planted among us," had "enjoyed their own government, privileges, and discipline, without any interruption by his predecessors or other English prelates, in all our Protestant princes' reigns, from King Edward VI. till this arch-prelate's molestation of, and attempts against, them [3]." But how far this man could be a judge, who reckoned that there was no religion apart from the dogmas of predestination, may be easily conceived. No one will deny, that the regulation of foreign churches in England is of essential consequence, otherwise themes might be discussed by the preachers, which would, in their practice, be destructive of the constitution. Nor does it follow that a foreign communion in this country, however pure and primitive it might have been in its discipline, should have been exempted from ecclesiastical cognizance, for the very circumstances of the times rendered it necessary that

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. ut sup. p. 753.

[2] Troubles and Trials, p. 166, 167.

[3] Canterburie's Doome, p. 388, 389.

enthusiasm should be checked without imposing a tyrannical restraint on the liberty of the individual. And it is unnecessary to remark, that the Church of England, above every other communion, has been the most tolerant in these matters,—that it has permitted, and does permit, to foreigners every liberty which they require; and while its own members have not unfrequently been restrained in foreign countries, has presented an illustrious example of liberality and forbearance.

The principles upon which Laud acted in these matters are not only justifiable, but highly expedient; and in requiring conformity, he did no more than his sectarian opponents. It is exceedingly easy to make a noise about liberty of conscience, but it is another thing to define it, or to ascertain how far it may extend. The peace and welfare of a state are to be preferred to the scrupulous fastidiousness of a few individuals, and faction is restrained with more facility when it is in its early progress. Laud unquestionably acted as a wise governor, in providing against the very appearance of schism, not by compelling men to *adhere* to the Church, but by observing those who still adhered, and who were, notwithstanding, undermining its constitution.

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

Laud charged with urging King to ...
thus declaration & King urged to leave Lan...
Neal &c to protection of the House - Committee on Religion for...
The Lambeth Articles declared to be the Doctrine of the Church...
The same day a Member Rolls having been served ...
Subpoena & had his goods arrested it is voted breach of Pri...
The Order said to have issued from King in Council but ...
this is denied by Attorney General - Heartily to protect his ...
Officers King avows it - A violent debate ensued ...
and Neal Weston are denounced - House declared disc...
willing to distinguish King's commands & acts of his Officers - b...
King refused to abandon them - House petitioned ad[journ]...
King issues proclamation to dissolve it - Speaker held in chair...
while 3 protests are read 1st that all who favour Popery or Armenianism...
are enemies to State 2d & 3d That all who favour subsidies of Tonnage...
& Poundage are equally so - dissolved March 10 1628.

DATE DUE

AUG 06 2002

OCT 22 2002

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
3 2400 00280 7703

2 vols.
E3/M
3/62

48867

BX
5199
L28
L3
v.1

Life and times of Wm. Laud
/ J.P. Lawson

DATE	ISSUED TO
	CBBD
APR 2 0 1987	Watkins 67U 14567
JUN 8 1987	RENEWED
SEP 2 3 1987	RENEWED
JAN 1 9 1988	RENEWED MAY 3 1 1988

BX
5199
L28
v.1

48867